This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

822.56
W52

UNIV. OF MICH.
APR 5 1907

822.56
W52

THE VERSIFICATION

OF

KING HORN

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1899

BY

HENRY S. WEST

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1907

THE VERSIFICATION

OF

KING HORN

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1899

BY
HENRY S. WEST

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1907

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

PREFACE v

THE GESTE OF KYNG HORN vii

OTHER TEXTS STUDIED x

BIBLIOGRAPHY xi

THE VERSIFICATION OF KING HORN.

Chapter I. 1

The Double Descent of Modern English Verse. § 1.
The Crux in Early Middle English. § 2.
The "Otfrid in England" Controversy. § 3

Chapter II. 6

The Heart of the Middle English Verse Crux is *King Horn*. § 1.
Schipper's "Dreihebigkeit" of *King Horn*. § 2.
The Plausibility of Schipper's Theory of the *Horn* Verse. § 3.

Chapter III. 12

Schipper's "Dreihebigkeit" is after all Nothing but Three-beat. § 1.
His Alleged Corroborative Text does not Support his Contention. § 2.

Chapter IV. 17

Why not Find in the *Horn* Short Line a Two-stress Rhythm? § 1.
How a Free Two-stress Reading of the Poem will Afford a Unifying Rhythm. § 2.
Further Analysis of *Horn* Lines and Couplets on a Two-stress Basis with Wholly Satisfying Results. § 3.
King Horn does not Require, seems even to Forbid, a Three-beat Scansion; and Readily Submits to a Two-stress Reading. § 4.

Chapter V. 21

Historic Presumption Favors Finding in the *Horn* Short Line a Two-stress Rhythm. § 1.
Incomplete Alliteration in *King Horn* does not Disprove its Claim of Being in Stress-verse. § 2.
The Alliteration in the *Horn* Points to a Two-stress Reading of its Lines. § 3.
Comparison of the *Horn* Couplet with Middle English Verse Clearly in the National Four-stress Free-rhythm Establishes their Metrical Likeness. § 4.

164155

Chapter VI. 49

The One Dissimilarity between the Verse of *King Horn* and the Later Free-rhythm. § 1.

The Preservation of a Recurring Shorter Line in the Later Free-rhythm Not Due to Conservatism. § 2.

The Earlier Lyric Proves the Shorter Line in the Cauda to be Due to Rime Couée. § 3.

Comparison of *King Horn* and *The Luxury of Women*. § 4.

How the Native Free-rhythm could be Cast into Rime Couée without Systematic Alliteration. § 5.

King Horn the Natural Outcome of Anglo-Saxon Tendencies and its Author's Environment. § 6.

Chapter VII. 64

The Seven Types of the *King Horn* Verse. § 1.

The *Horn* Hypermetric Lines. § 2.

Percentages of the Several Types. § 3.

Management of Alliteration in *King Horn*. § 4.

Conclusion. § 5.

VITA AUCTORIS. 89

POSTSCRIPT. 91

PREFACE.

In grateful acknowledgment I wish to say that I was prompted to the following study by Prof. James W. Bright. During a graduate course on the history of English versification, conducted in 1897–98, Professor Bright argued that Schipper's "dreihebig" scansion of *King Horn* is unnecessary and illogical; and suggested that his own view of the verse of this poem might be worked out as a new dissertation. This I undertook to do: and, while Professor Bright is not to be held responsible for the details of my monograph nor for the special process by which I attempt to controvert Schipper, I am happy in knowing that my preceptor is in full accord with the main thesis here advanced; namely, that the short line of *King Horn* is a two-stress movement in English free-rhythm, that the *Horn* couplet is in its internal structure only a regular Middle English expansion of the Anglo-Saxon four-stress long-line.

After this acknowledgment I must enter a disclaimer of obligation in another quarter. A Yale dissertation presented for the doctoral degree one year ago by Mr. C. M. Lewis [*The Foreign Sources of Modern English Versification*, Halle, 1898] contains the following passages on the verse of *King Horn*:—

"Next we find that the short lines thus formed, by virtue of the tendency to multiplication of syllables already mentioned, are by no means limited to two accents, but commonly take three or even four [Schipper, Metr. I, 180 f.]. With deference, however, to the views of Schipper (and others quoted by him), it must be insisted that the third and fourth accents in these early verses are not essential features of the rhythm. In such a passage as the following, for example,

Hi wénden to wísse
Of here líf to mísse.
Al the dáy and al the níght
Til hit spráng day líght

King Horn 121–4.

it is clear that if we regard the first verse as having two essential accents, the second three, and the third four, the rhythm ceases at once to be homogeneous. We should read such a passage with especial regard to the two principle [*sic*] stresses in each line;—they are the ones that determine the rhythm;—and the subsidiary stresses will then be found to cause no disturbance." And further on: "*King Horn* on the other hand exhibits more fidelity to English tradition, clinging still, in theory, to the original two accents: but its tendency to verses of three or four actual accents assimilates it more or less closely to the *Pater Noster*, and in either of the poems many lines can be pointed out which might just as well have been introduced in the other" [pp. 93–4, and 96].

In spite of Mr. Lewis's words about "the subsidiary stresses" and the "verses of three or four actual accents" in *King Horn*, I quote the foregoing sentences in order to credit him with having uttered even so mild a demur to Schipper's treatment of the *Horn* verse. But I would say that I received for my own study no suggestion whatever from Mr. Lewis's work. I did not even read it until some time after I had made the first draft of my argument, and had formulated my seven types of the *Horn* rhythm. I gladly add, however, that Mr. Lewis's dissertation is a valuable contribution to the historical study of English prosody.

HENRY S. WEST.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
May 1, 1899.

THE GESTE OF KYNG HORN.

The Geste of Kyng Horn, perhaps the very oldest of all the extant Middle English metrical romances, is an epic lay of the early part of the thirteenth century, composed in the South-East of England by an author now wholly unknown. It is preserved in three manuscripts:

(1) University Library, Cambridge: MS. Gg. 4. 27. 2.
(2) Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS. Laud, Misc. 108.
(3) British Museum, London: MS. Harleian, 2253.

These manuscript versions are commonly referred to as C, O, and H respectively. The oldest and best of the three is C.

The poem has been printed a number of times as follows:

1802—Ritson, *Ancient English Metrical Romances.*
1845—Michel, *Horn et Rimenhild* (Bannatyne Club).
1866—Lumby, *King Horn* etc. (E. E. T. S. 14)
1867—Morris, *Specimens of Early English.*
1867—Maetzner, *Altenglische Sprachproben.*
1872—Horstmann, Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. L.
1881—Wissmann, *Lied von King Horn* (Quellen u. Forschungen, XLV)[1]

In making the present investigation I first scanned out completely the C text as given (with some additions from O and H) by Morris; and this I quote as ^{m}C, with the line numbering found in the Morris and Skeat *Specimens*, vol. I. Furthermore, in giving examples of my types [Chap. VII] of the two-stress movement of the poem, I constantly quote from the ^{m}C text.

But in working up my argument on the *Horn* problem, I found it more convenient to make use of Wissmann's edition. It is true that Wissmann's text is a "berichtigt" text: that is, in an

[1] A still later edition is noted in my *Postscript*, p. 91.

attempt to restore a reading that shall be closer to the original than is any one of the extant manuscripts, he produced a composite text in normalized spelling with lines more or leveled between the expansion of one manuscript and the conciseness of another. Moreover, it was an important object with Wissmann to present, as far as possible, lines that would scan easily as "Otfrid verse." On the other hand, however, Wissmann did consistently keep close to MS. C;[1] and I had in his edition the very great convenience of seeing at a glance the variant readings of all the manuscripts.

Accordingly all my citations by number only (except in Chap. VII) are from Wissmann's text; and where I give a line number *followed* by a letter (C, H, or O) the reference is to the variant, or the MS. C, reading at that point. Again, where an extended passage from O or H is given among the variants, and Wissmann cites the lines with the numbering of their own MS. (as at pp. 45–7), I refer to these lines as O 910, etc., and H 891, etc.

Morris also, one readily perceives, has "corrected" his text (note, for example, the passage at ll. 1338 f.) in accordance with his assumed *three-beat* reading of its verse [see *Specimens*, I, Introd., p. xxxviii]. Hence, before beginning my metrical analysis of the poem, I restored the C text to a more *uncorrected* state by the following alterations of the ^{m}C print:

1. Dele Morris's insertions in ll. 2 (the dative ending *-e*, which he added *without brackets* to avoid juxtaposed stresses), 86, 124, 192, 194, 241, 264, 283, 288, 335, 344, 350, 352, 370, 393, 420, 435, 449, 469, 519, 579, 679, 683, 686, 820, 858, 923, 1010, 1034, 1074, 1090, 1180, 1186, 1201, 1210, 1246, 1279, 1281, 1314, 1338, 1340 (*icom* pret. t; cf. 39, 1396, 1526), 1341, 1347, 1348, 1350, 1407, 1417, 1487, 1490.

2. Leave MS. C unchanged in ll. 41 (*ofherde*), 414, 476, 579, 672, 718, 742, 1216, 1220.

On my own part, however, I make the following emendations

[1] Bei einer kritischen Behandlung des Textes werden wir also am besten stets von C ausgehen, und nur begründeten Erwägungen folgend die Lesart der andern HSS. aufnehmen.—Wissmann, *L. v. K. H.*, s. XI.

of the ^{m}C text: l. 42 read *answerde* (cf. 199); l. 568 dele *telle* (following O and H); l. 763 read *flette* for *sette* (following O and H); l. 823 read *sleh* for *ouercomeþ* (following H); l. 840 dele *men*, and read *cristene* (following O and H); l. 1149 read *to* instead of *for* (following O and H); l. 1337 read *serue* for *have* (following O and H); l. 1358 read *so* for *king* (following O); l. 1434 dele *men* (following O and H).

For the present study, therefore, the texts to be used are—

R. Morris, *Specimens of Early English*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1887, p. 237 f.

T. Wissmann, *Das Lied von King Horn*, Strassburg, 1881 (Quellen u. Forschungen, XLV).

OTHER TEXTS STUDIED.

Besides *King Horn* the following texts have been examined. The editors' prefaces and introductions to these texts contain some important metrical observations.

Alexander Fragment (Alex. A).	E. E. T. S. extra 1.
Alexander and Dindimus (Alex. B).	E. E. T. S. extra 31.
Wars of Alexander (Alex. C),	E. E. T. S. extra 47.
Altenglische Dichtungen des MS. Harl., 2253, edited by K. Böddeker.	Berlin, 1878.
Awntyrs of Arthure.	Madden, *Syr Gawayne*, etc. Bannatyne Club, 1839.
Sir Degrevant.	Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*, Camden Society, 1844.
Destruction of Troy.	E. E. T. S. 39 and 56.
The Feest.	Hazlitt, *Early Popular Poetry of England*, 1866.
Gawayn and the Green Knight.	E. E. T. S. 4.
Golagrus and Gawain.	Anglia, II, 410.
Joseph of Arimathie.	E. E. T. S. 44.
Morte Arthure.	E. E. T. S. 8.
Sir Perceval of Galles.	Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*, Camden Society, 1844.
The Pistill of Susan (or Susanna).	Anglia, I, 93.
Rauf Coilȝear.	E. E. T. S. extra 39.
Richard the Redeless.	E. E. T. S. 54.
Rouland and Vernagu.	E. E. T. S. extra 39.
The Towneley Plays.	E. E. T. S. extra 71.
William of Palerne.	E. E. T. S. extra 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.[1]

Any theory of the versification of *King Horn* must take into account the related rhythms of preceding and succeeding times, the Anglo-Saxon verse and the Middle English alliterative verse. In the following list, therefore, will be found some books and articles not specifically concerned with our poem; but they guide one in that wider survey which is a needful preliminary to the thorough discussion of our special subject. It seemed, moreover, quite important to insert a number of references on the "Otfrid in England" controversy.

(*a*) *General Works.*

E. Sievers, Altgermanische Metrik, Halle, 1893. An admirable summary of Sievers' doctrine is to be found in Bright's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, 3rd ed., 1894, p. 229 f. (N. Y., Holt & Co.).

J. Schipper, Grundriss der Englischen Metrik, Wien u. Leipzig, 1895 (being v. II of the Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie).

J. Schipper, Altenglische Metrik, Bonn, 1881 (being part I of his Englische Metrik).

E. Guest, History of English Rhythms, new edition by Skeat, London, 1882.

F. B. Gummere, Handbook of Poetics, 3rd ed., Boston, 1891.

H. Paul, Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie, 2nd ed., Strassburg, 1893. See articles in v. II : by Ten Brink, p. 516 f.; by Brandl, p. 619 f.; by Sievers, p. 862 f.; by Luick, p. 994 f. and p. 1009 f.; by Schipper, p. 1030 f.

H. Morley, English Writers, v. III, London, 1888.

G. Körting, Encyklopaedie u. Methodologie d. Englischen Philologie, p. 388, Heilbronn, 1888.

[1] A few more titles are added in the *Postscript*, p. 91.

G. Körting, Grundriss der Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur, 2nd ed., Münster, 1893. Notes on metre from Aelfric to Langland, p. 63 to p. 159 passim.

J. Storm, Englische Philologie, v. II, p. 1027, Leipzig, 1896.

H. Sweet, History of English Sounds, 2nd ed., p. 163, Oxford, 1888.

R. Wülker, Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächischen Litteratur, p. 108, Leipzig, 1885.

(*b*) *Special Studies.*

Anglia :—Trautmann, I. 115; Rosenthal, I. 414; Trautmann, II. 153, 407; Wissmann, IV. 342; Einenkel, IV. Anz. 91; Einenkel, V. 105, and Anz. 30, 139; Schröer, V. 238; Wissmann, V. 466; Schipper, V. Anz. 88; Trautmann, V. Anz. 111; Einenkel, VI. Anz. 64; Holthaus, VI. Anz. 104; Einenkel, VII. Anz. 200; Trautmann, VII. Anz. 211; Menthel, VIII. Anz. 49; Trautmann, VIII. Anz. 144; Schipper, VIII. Anz. 246; Menthel, X. 105; Luick, XI. 392, 553; Luick, XII. 437; Teichmann, XIII. 140; Trautmann, XVIII. 83.

Anglia, Beiblatt :—Luick, IV. 193; Trautmann, V. 87; Luick, XII. 33.

Anglia, Mittheilungen :—Luick, IV. 200.

W. Bock, Zur Destruction of Troy, Halle, 1883.

A. Brandl, Litteraturblatt f. German. u. Roman. Philologie, IV, 132.

J. Börsch, Metrik u. Poetik d. Owl and Nightingale, Münster, 1883.

J. Caro, Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild. Eine Untersuchung, Breslau, 1886.

J. Caro, Englische Studien, XII. 323.

C. L. Crow, Zur Geschichte d. Kurzen Reimpaars im Mittelenglischen, Göttingen, 1892.

E. Einenkel, The Early Eng. Life of St. Katherine, E. E. T. S. 80.

E. Einenkel, Über Verfasser einiger Neuags. Schriften, Leipzig, 1881.
E. Einenkel, Englische Studien, IX. 368.
A. J. Ellis, Trans. Philological Society, London, 1875–6. 442.
E. Gropp, On the Language of the Proverbs of Alfred, Halle, 1879.
H. F. Heath, Trans. Philological Society, London, 1891–4. 375.
G. Heesch, Über Sprache u. Versbau des Debate of Body and Soul, Kiel, 1884.
E. Jessen, Zeitschrift f. Deutsche Philologie, II. 138.
M. Kaluza, Studien zum German. Alliterationsvers, Heft 1 & 2, Berlin, 1894.
M. Kaluza, Englische Studien, XVI. 169.
E. Kölbing, Englische Studien, VI. 153.
B. Kuhnke, Die allit. Langzeile in Sir Gawayn and the Green Knight, Weimar, 1899 (to be complete as Heft 4 of Kaluza's Studien zum Germ. Allitsv.).
C. M. Lewis, The Foreign Sources of Modern English Versification, Halle, 1898.
J. Lawrence, Chapters on Allit. Verse, London, 1893.
H. Lübke, The Aunters of Arthur at the Tarnewathelan, Berlin, 1883.
F. J. Mather, Jr., Publs. Mod. Language Association of America, XII (new S. V).
W. Mitford, Principles of Harmony and of Mechanism of Verse, 2nd ed., London, 1874.
The Nation, New York, Oct. 12, 1882.
O. Noltemeier, Uber The Knightly Tale of Golagros and Gawane, Marburg, 1889.
E. Penner, Herrig's Archiv, 83. 211.
J. Schipper, Englische Studien, V. 488; IX. 184; X. 192.
J. Schipper, Litteraturblatt f. Germ. u. Rom. Philologie, III. 369.
W. Scholle, Quellen u. Forschungen, LII.
A. Schlüter, Herrig's Archiv, 71. 357.
W. W. Skeat, Essay on Allit. Poetry, in Hales and Furnivall, Bishop Percy's Folio MS., vol. III, London, 1868.

A. Stimming, Englische Studien, I. 351.
G. J. Tamson, Word Stress in English, Halle, 1898.
(being Heft 3 of Morsbach's Studien z. Engl. Philologie)
B. Ten Brink, Englische Studien VI. 150.
C. Thiem, Das Alteng. Gedicht King Horn, Rostock, 1874.
M. Tonndorf, Rauf Coilȝear Untersuchungen, Halle, 1893.
M. Tonndorf, The Taill of Rauf Coilȝear, Berlin, 1894.
W. Wächter, Untersuch. ü. Roland and Vernagu, and Otuel, Berlin, 1885.
T. Wissmann, King Horn Untersuchungen, Quellen u. Forschungen, XVI.
T. Wissmann, Litteraturblatt III. 133, 292.
J. Zupitza, Anzeiger f. Deutsches Alterthum, IV. 149; IX. 181.

THE VERSIFICATION OF *KING HORN.*

CHAPTER I.

THE DOUBLE DESCENT OF MODERN ENGLISH VERSE. § 1.
THE CRUX IN EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH. § 2.
THE "OTFRID IN ENGLAND" CONTROVERSY. § 3.

§ 1. The story of the English art of verse from Widsith to Kipling is no unentangled narrative of a single thread. On the contrary, modern English versification is a mingled current, not to be rightly understood until it is traced back into its widely differing tributaries; to whose fundamental unlikeness is due that escape from a repressive law of strict syllabism which gave to our verse in the hands of Shakespeare and his successors its glorious variety of movement. To seek thus the origin of the verse molds into which the English folk cast their poetry, and then to trace the historic descent of their favorite rhythmic forms, indigenous and imported, through the successive poetical monuments of English literature, is obviously a pursuit no less fascinating in itself than indispensable for a full aesthetic appreciation of English poetry. Important though and inviting as is the historical study of English versification, yet the way of the investigator is beset with many tangles, very hard to unravel; and all the excellent work already done, notably by the German scholars, in this field has left still many a difficulty unsolved.

However, from amidst the dark tangles of the subject and the illuminating wrangles of the doctors, the one comprehensive fact of the history of English versification has come forth with the greatest clearness: there are plainly two streams of verse coursing down English literature. The one is the native Anglo-Saxon long-line, inherited from the prehistoric period of Germanic unity.

It is a verse in *free-rhythm*[1] moving on four primary stresses;[2] but successive lines are not at all confined to equal syllabic volume. Originally the only verse employed by the English, the national four-stress long-line, was, in the opinion of most scholars—with the notable exception of Schipper—quite suppressed[3] for a long period after the Norman Conquest, and is hardly to be discerned again until its remarkable revival in the fourteenth century.[4]

The other stream of verse was introduced into English literature by the influence of French and Latin verse forms. It is the imported current of *beat-verse*, coming into vogue after the Conquest, in a restricted rhythm: that is, with regularly spaced accents and at least approximately equalized syllabism. The orderliness and smoothness of the new prosody recommended it above the growing lawlessness of Anglo-Saxon art, then fallen into decay: consequently, ever since its introduction into Britain, from the eleventh century to the present, beat-verse has been dominant in English poetry.

This fundamental fact of a double prosody in English literature since the Conquest unveils the formerly incomprehensible mysteries of Middle English versification: for an order and a method are now discoverable where once students of Early English saw only chaos. Especially certain do we now feel about the true rhythmic types of that large body of poetry in the revived alliterative verse, rimed as well as unrimed, which dates from the end of the thirteenth century and is seen flourishing during more than two centuries.[5] In spite though of the lucid and interesting man-

[1] My distinction of *two-stress, four-stress, stress-verse, free-rhythm* as against *two-beat, four-beat, beat-verse, beat-measures*, will be readily understood by those acquainted with the terminology employed by recent metrical investigators: for example, I use *four-stress* exactly as Schipper uses "vierhebig," and *four-beat* for his "viertaktig."

[2] It is a fundamental assumption of the present study that Sievers' exposition of Anglo-Saxon verse is the correct one.

[3] At least, they say, no documents worthy of note are extant.

[4] See in Paul's *Grundriss* the treatment of ME. verse by Luick, v. II, p. 994 f.

[5] We adopt Luick's scansion of the ME. alliterative poetry. See his articles in *Anglia*, XI, 392 f. and 553 f.; and XII, 437 f.; and also in Paul's *Grundriss*, II, 1009 f. See Schipper, *Grdriss. d. Eng. Metr.*, p. 75 f.

ner in which the underlying double basis of English metrics can be outlined for a study of the historic descent of English verse from its two sources, native and foreign, there falls squarely across the path of the investigator a set of poetical monuments whose versification has proved so deep a crux that the most penetrating efforts, even of the Germans, have not yet resulted in scanning them satisfactorily.

§ 2. The crux in the course of English verse lies in the period of two and a half centuries immediately succeeding the Norman Conquest. The imported beat-verse, beginning in Anglo-Norman poems, can be clearly traced down English literature from Orm through Chaucer to the present day. But there remains to us, belonging to the period between the Conquest and the fourteenth century, also a considerable body of versified literature *not* in beat-verse, of which Layamon's *Brut* and the metrical romance of *King Horn* are the two conspicuous documents. What of the versification of these twelfth and thirteenth century poems that are not in beat-verse?

To find a wholly satisfying answer to this question is difficult. The monuments themselves present on first examination, a most ambiguous appearance: they really seem, one is tempted to say, to be wavering between the old English free-rhythm and the new Romance measured rhythm. So difficult indeed has it been found hitherto to scan these poems either as beat-verse or else as plainly descendants of the Anglo-Saxon free-rhythm, that a special theory has been advanced to explain them.

§ 3. The contention supported by the almost unanimous consensus of the competent *in Germany* is this: just these Early English poems, which cannot possibly be in Romance beat-verse, which appear *to the Germans* (except Schipper) to be quite as certainly not direct descendants of the Anglo-Saxon verse, belong in a body to a third system of versification, which is the English exact parallel of the "Otfrid verse" of Germany. The promulgation of this theory has elicited a controversy, by no means the least interesting among the many wholesome discussions that have arisen out of the new English philology. Against the numerous ardent supporters of the view that the poems of the *Brut*-

King Horn group represent metrically "Otfrid in England," one great opponent has maintained a conspicuous, if not a firmly unyielding resistance.

Into the details of this interesting contention we cannot enter; but the "Otfrid in England" controversy is so important that a clear statement of its present status is desirable.

There are now two schools of opinion as to the metrical character of the group of poems, having the *Brut* and *King Horn* for its nucleus.

1. According to the doctrine of the majority (represented by Luick's article in Paul's *Grdriss.*[6] and by Sweet's paragraph in his *Hist. of Eng. Sounds*, p. 163) after the Anglo-Saxon period was brought to a close, there followed a blank of two centuries, so far as extant documents can testify, in the history of the native free-rhythm in the four-stress long-line; then at the end of the thirteenth century and in the beginning of the fourteenth the old fashion of alliteration and with it the old free-rhythm was revived with wonderful enthusiasm and effect. Just in the interval when the native rhythm was suppressed, arose and flourished the English "Otfrid verse"; and it is in this peculiar rhythm that the *Brut-Horn* group of poems is composed. Ingenious hypotheses are offered to explain: first, how the original English free-rhythm was preserved from extinction during the two centuries of its suppression, so as to be at hand for revival in the fourteenth century; and secondly, how the English "Otfrid verse" developed from latent native elements, or whence it was imported.

2. Against the confident opinion of the majority Schipper firmly and rightly (it is here assumed) insists upon his own opposing view. He has pierced the heart of the "Otfrid in England" contention by his argument against the unwarranted assumption of the existence in twelfth and thirteenth century English of a word accent like that commonly believed to be present in the Old High German "reimvers." Schipper contends for the same natural word stress in Middle English as that assumed for the basis of Sievers' five-type rhythm of Anglo-Saxon verse. In a foot-note of

[6] *Grundriss*, II, 994 f.

his new *Metrik* is found Schipper's final judgment on "Otfrid in England": "Nach unserer Überzeugung ist der Otfrid'sche Vers in England niemals nachgebildet und in alt- oder mittelenglischer Zeit dort überhaupt nicht bekannt geworden" [*Grdriss. d. Engl. Metr.*, 1895, p. 75].[7]

Schipper's view requires no fanciful hypotheses. The whole body of verse classified in Paul's *Grundriss* as the English "Otfrid verse" is according to Schipper "die weitere Entwickelung der alliterierenden Langzeile freier Richtung" [*Ibid.*, p. 54.]; but it is to be divided into two sections representing a less developed and a more developed stage. The one is the immediate descendant of the Anglo-Saxon four-stress line, though here the verse is growing constantly looser and more irregular as it surrenders the strict Anglo-Saxon rules of alliteration and assumes more and more end-rime under the influence of contemporary beat-verse: at this stage stand the *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Brut*. The other part is that *new fully-rimed oblique offshoot* from the direct national line of descent, the distinct "dreihebig" verse of *King Horn*.

It is assumed as a premise of the present study that Schipper's argument on Middle English word accent is wholly correct, and has never been shaken by the adherents of the opposing school; and that the "Otfrid in England" theory is an unverified and untenable hypothesis. The question remaining for the present investigation is therefore this: has Schipper himself hit upon the correct reading of the *Horn*? The attempt will be here made to show that he has not set forth the true rhythm of *King Horn*.

---

[7] See also Schipper's foot-note in Paul's *Grundriss*, II, p. 1021.

CHAPTER II.

THE HEART OF THE MIDDLE ENGLISH VERSE CRUX IS *King Horn*. § 1.
SCHIPPER'S "DREIHEBIGKEIT" OF *King Horn*. § 2.
THE PLAUSIBILITY OF SCHIPPER'S THEORY OF THE *Horn* VERSE. § 3.

§ 1. The most cursory view of the "Otfrid in England" controversy makes it evident that in the last analysis *King Horn* forms the heart of this tangled knot of apparently mixed Germanic and Romance versification, of uncertain word accent and sentence stress. The *Horn* is the most Otfrid-like of the whole group of poems; and but for this monument the "Otfrid in England" theory would, in all likelihood, be deprived of the faintest shadow of plausibility.[8] Again it is in *King Horn* that even Schipper sees the national long-line, under the influence of systematic rime, take a decided turn *away from the "strenge richtung"* of the native free-rhythm: in this poem, says Schipper, the "langzeile freier Richtung . . . verläuft nun sehr einfach und wie nach seiner bisherigen Geschichte kaum anders zu erwarten war" [*G. d. E. Metrik*, p. 71].[9] Thus the important position held by this romance in any discussion of Middle English metrics justifies the present study; and our first task will be to subject Schipper's treatment of the *Horn* verse to a critical examination. For this purpose we shall use his latest deliverance on the subject, the *Grundriss der Englischen Metrik* of 1895, rather than his earlier exposition in the *Altenglische Metrik*, 1881 (*Eng. Metr.* I).

[8] Note how Luick makes *K. Horn* the perfected form of "Otfrid in England," Paul's *Grdriss.*, II, p. 1004, § 17. See also Wissmann, *Horn Unters.*, p. 56, § 5.

[9] But in *King Horn* the "freie richtung" of the alliterative long-line came to its end, says Schipper; while the *conservative* form lived on for three hundred years longer [ibid., p. 75].

§ 2. Schipper's final opinion on the versification of *King Horn*, expressed in a single sentence, is this:

"Die vorwiegende Versform, in welcher dies Gedicht geschrieben ist, sind, ähnlich wie bei Layamon in der zweiten Hälfte seines Werkes, Verse von drei Hebungen mit klingendem Ausgang." [*G. d. E. M.*, p. 71.]

Unquestionably the prevailing type of the *Horn* verse has a movement similar to that in a large part of the *Brut*. But is it right to scan such verses as Schipper does, and to treat them as if composed in a rhythm of *three* stresses (drei Hebungen)?

The moment *King Horn* is read as Schipper directs, it seems to run as a very limping beat-verse of three beats, because: first, there is a more or less regular alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables; and secondly, the logically weakest, even the wholly non-significant words of the sentence—unemphatic pronouns, negatives, verbs, especially the substantive verb, prepositions, and conjunctions—are fully stressed in order to get a third ictus into every verse.

For example, take the following passage accented, as nearly as I can guess, just as Schipper would have:

Of álle wýmmànne
Wúrst was Gódhild þànne;
For Múrri hèo weop sóre
Àn̄d for Hórn ȝute móre.
He wénten ùt of hálle
Fram hìre máidenes álle;
Ùnder a róche of stóne,
Þèr heo líuede alóne.
Þér heo sèruede góde
Aȝènes þe páynes forbóde:
Þér heo sèruede críste
Þat no páyn hìt ne wíste. MC ll. 67–78.

The marking of one ictus with a *grave* accent, produces only the thinnest illusion of something different from a three-beat verse. As well might we say that the following verses from Surrey so marked are not in three-beat measure:

"The fíre it cànnot fréze:
For ìt is nót his kínde,
Nor trúe love cànnot lése
The cónstance òf the mínde." [10]

And let it be acknowledged at once that in certain passages of *King Horn*, and particularly in selected lines, a three-beat scansion would go well enough. Morris [11] and Gummere [12] indeed, accepting Schipper's contention as against the "Otfrid in England" theory, marked the type of the *Horn* verse outright thus—(x) x́ x x́ x x́ (x); for this was the way Schipper himself indicated his scansion of *Horn* in the *Metrik*, I, 1881 [p. 183f.].

But Schipper now perceives that *King Horn* must not be made an overt beat-verse: because, in attempting to apply the above formula to the whole poem or even to lengthy continuous passages, we come upon places far too frequent to be overlooked where the effort to read three metrically equivalent accents into the line produces an intolerable effect; and, further, in many verses we should have to juxtapose two of the ictus (often putting both on one word as in *wímmánne* above or *Múrrý* l. 4) in a way totally against the genius of beat-verse.[13] Thus has it come about that Morris and Gummere present a marking of the *Horn* line, taken from Schipper's *Altenglische Metrik*, which the latter author himself has since rejected.

Schipper in his final discussion of the *Horn* sets up an artificial distinction [14] between "dreihebig," three-stress, and "dreitaktig," three-beat. The verse of *King Horn*, he says, is not in three-

[10] Quoted from Gummere, *Poetics*, p. 197.

[11] *Specimens*, I, Introd., p. xxxviii. [12] *Poetics*, p. 179.

[13] On his unsophisticated scansion of *Horn* with three downright acute accents Morris remarks: "The general effect is good, but modern metre would not approve of the bringing of two *accented* syllables into close juxtaposition"—as in Bí þe sé-síde, Ánd þi fáir-nésse, þát his blód hátte.

[14] I say *artificial*, because it is a distinction assumed solely to support Schipper's scansion of *King Horn*. He can point to no other "dreihebig" poem except the *twelve lines* of the *Signs of Death* (on which see Chap. III, below). No such grounds exist for a distinction between "dreihebig" and "dreitaktig" as for the valuable distinction between "vierhebig" and "viertaktig."

beat movement of course: it is a three-stress line. Consequently Schipper carefully avoids marking any verse of our poems thus— (x) x́ x x́ x x́ (x). That would make the line appear too "taktierend," too much like beat-verse (although, it is to be insisted, that is just what the *Horn* line ought to become, when we take to stressing unemphatic words to fill out the premised rhythmic formula of three ictus). The five typical verse forms of *King Horn*, as now made out by Schipper, are the following [*Grds. d. Eng. Metr.*, p. 71–2]:

1. "Die vorwiegende Versform .... sind .... Verse von drei Hebungen mit klingendem Ausgang nach Art der folgenden:

Hórn þu àrt wel kéne

Dieser Typus ... kommt in circa 1300 Versen von den 1530 Versen der Dichtung vor."

2. A "zweihebige Versform tritt noch vereinzelt zu Tage" as in:

Hi wénden to wísse.

But this type, we are told, appears in both lines of the couplet "nur einmal, nämlich in dem Verse:

Hi slóȝen and fúȝten | þe níȝt and þe úȝten."

3. "Die dritte Versform, drei Hebungen mit stumpfem Versausgang, begegnet ebenfalls seltener, z. B.:

Léue at hìre he nám."

4. "Die vierte häufiger vorkommende Versform zeigt vier Hebungen mit stumpfem Versausgange:

Ófte hàdde Hòrn beo wó
Ac nèure wúrs þan hìm was þó."

5. "Die fünfte Versform, vier Hebungen bei klingendem Ausgange, kommt gleichfalls nicht selten vor, z. B.:

To déþe hè hem álle brò ȝte
His fáder dèþ wel dére hi bò ȝte."

§ 3. Disregarding varieties of a main type, we see that the scansion of *King Horn*, as Schipper teaches, reduces itself to three formulas:

Type (1) (×) x́ × x́ ×
Type (2) (×) x́ × x̀ × x́ (×)
Type (3) (×) x́ × x̀ × x́ × x̀ (×).

Of these three, Type (1) is sure. Type (3) may look like a logical development from Type (1); there are some lines requiring to be so marked, and such a formula will be posited for them in the new analysis of the *Horn* verse to be made in succeeding chapters. But a close examination of the *examples* Schipper scans thus on pp. 72–74 (except the one line above—His fader deþ, etc., where such an accentuation is inevitable) admits of no other interpretation than that his "vierhebig" type is a mere concession to the adherents of the four-stress (to the half-line or short-line) theory of "Otfrid in England."[15]

The remaining formula above requires especial attention. Type (2), the prevailing "dreihebig" verse of *King Horn*, is *in fact* also a concession to the theory of "Otfrid in England," in that Schipper is stressing for his middle ictus all sorts of weak words and supposing the "fehlende Senkung," the suppressed thesis, which would differentiate in Schipper's theory the *Horn* "dreihebigkeit" from simple "dreitaktigkeit." Only in refusing to admit an accent on the final *-e* has he maintained his stand against "Otfrid in England"; this he says himself [top of p. 73]: "Nur können wir natürlich . . . . den Nebenton auf den klingenden Endungen dreihebiger Verse, den übrigens auch Luick hier nicht mehr mit solcher Entschiedenheit fordert wie dort [*i. e.* in Layamon], für das Metrum des King Horn ebenso wenig zugestehen."

On the other hand *in appearance* this Type (2) is something more. The careful employment of a grave accent now instead of a third acute is an apparent gain over the marking of 1881:

[15] For a graphic demonstration of Schipper's compromise with "Otfrid in England" one has only to put side by side his metrical accentuation of the *Brut* and *Horn* and Luick's accentuation of them as "nationale Reimverse" [Paul's *Grdriss.*, II, 998 ff., especially from § 7 on].

because it makes the *Horn* "dreihebigkeit" look like an *actual transition* stage between the old native half-line of two primary stresses with a frequent secondary stress (in types D and E) and a new three-beat verse formed on Romance models; so that the *Horn* couplet would really appear to be an intermediate form between the native English alliterative long-line and an alexandrine with leonine rime. Observe the couplets scanned on p. 73 with Schipper's artful new marking beside his retention of the old letters, A, B, C, etc., for his *Horn* types.

When we read a passage of the poem [s. above p. 7] according to Schipper's scansion, it felt like nothing more than a lame beat-verse; but if *King Horn* does indeed exhibit a mid-form between two-stress and three-beat, Schipper's terminology and his Type (2) with its grave accent might be a welcome addition to English metrical theory: a valuable distinction would exist between the *Horn* three-stress verse and a thoroughgoing three-beat verse.

Now the plausibility of such a contention, that the *King Horn* rhythm represents a transition stage between the native verse and the imported verse, depends upon the answers to be obtained to three questions.

First: Does the advocate himself really believe in this "dreihebig" verse as something not three-beat? And what collateral evidence can he adduce from other poems in favor of his "dreihebig" scansion?

Second: Does the *Horn*, when analyzed with one's vision wholly undisturbed by an Otfrid illusion, *require* one to read thus into every line a third stress, to be *felt as part of the rhythmic type* and yet to be always only a secondary stress?

Third: On the other hand, can any collateral evidence be arrayed against the acceptance of Schipper's proposed formula for the prevailing *Horn* rhythm?

The following four chapters will be devoted to answering these questions.

CHAPTER III.

SCHIPPER'S "DREIHEBIGKEIT" IS AFTER ALL NOTHING BUT THREE-BEAT. § 1.

HIS ALLEGED CORROBORATIVE TEXT DOES NOT SUPPORT HIS CONTENTION. § 2.

§ 1. Taking up the first question toward a critical estimate of Schipper's position on the verse of *King Horn*, we ask: Is Schipper himself firm and consistent in showing that the typical verse of *King Horn* is one of "drei Hebungen," and that this means something distinct from three-beat verse?

On p. 71 Schipper begins persuasively. After Layamon the native "Langzeile freier Richtung" developed further: for the external verse ornament rime was systematically introduced, while alliteration was more and more discarded; but in its internal structure also the verse underwent development—"Die Senkungen [p. 71] zwischen den Hebungen treten regelmässiger ein, und die stärker betonte, resp. betonten derselben werden zu Hebungen oder nähern sich ihnen wenigstens erheblich an rhythmischer Bedeutung." Therefore in *King Horn*, the climax of the "freie Behandlung der alliterierenden Langzeile" [p. 75], the verse stands thus: "Die vorwiegende Versform .... sind .... Verse von drei Hebungen." The choice of terms here and more particularly the difference between Schipper's accentuation of 1881 and his present marking either mean that three-stress is *not* equal to three-beat, or else it all means nothing; and the latter alternative will leave Schipper with no ground for the term "dreihebig."

If now we turn to p. 87 (last lines) of Schipper's book we find that there he comes as near as possible, without actually doing so, to calling the *King Horn* line a verse of three *beats*. In treating of certain more expanded verses of rimed poems in the Middle English development "strenger Richtung" of the native rhythm,

he says that here "die zweihebigen Verse öfters einen gestreckteren .... Bau haben, der es ermöglicht, manche derselben, in denen nebentonige Senkungen vorkommen, als dreitaktige Verse zu lesen (oder dreihebige nach Art derjenigen im *King Horn*)." Here we have not quite caught Schipper making the verse of *King Horn* openly three-beat: he studiously clings to the term "dreihebig" for the verse of the *Horn* itself.

But on the very next page he at last entraps himself: for we are told out and out that certain other loose verses are "dreihebig, resp. dreitaktig." The sentence is [p. 89, § 51]: "In anderen Gedichten sind mit den vierhebigen Versen des Aufgesanges im Abgesange Verse verbunden, die zum Theil einen schwankenden, entweder dreihebigen (resp. dreitaktigen) oder zweihebigen Rhythmus haben." The second of the alternatives here suggested, "zweihebig," is very significant for the contention of the present study, that the prevailing line of *King Horn* is one of *two* stresses: but our immediate purpose is to direct attention to the first alternative. In the illustrative stanza that Schipper here gives from the poem of *Richard of Cornwall* [Böddeker, p. 98 f.] the typical line of this "dreihebig, resp. dreitaktig" character is—

Ant só he dûde móre.

As this line is, both in itself and also as Schipper accents it, exactly similar to the "vorwiegende Versform" of *King Horn*, we may confidently remark that therefore the verse of *King Horn*, as treated by Schipper, becomes "dreihebig, respective dreitaktig," or in vulgar English *a verse of three beats*. It hence appears that Schipper himself has inadvertently confirmed what we felt from the very beginning: namely, that to read *King Horn* as he would have us do, makes it nothing but three-beat verse—just as Morris and Gummere treated it.

Turning another page of Schipper's manual, we find him treating lines much like the *Horn* verse as two-stress or *three-beat* verse: the argument would of course work the other way, and make *King Horn* itself, if not two-stress, then simply three-beat. He has a short paragraph [p. 90] on the *Satire on Ecclesiastical*

Courts [Böddeker, p. 109 f]. As examples of the internal "Schweifreimverse" of this poem look at the following lines:

ant rewen alle huere redes	6
so grimly he on me gredes	9
ant leyþ ys leg on lonke	21
ant þonkfulliche hem þonke	30
nys no wyt in is nolle	45
swart ant al to swolle	48
þen so to fote hem falle	66
henne in þis worldes wynne	78

These verses are rhythmically of the same character as Schipper's "vorwiegende Versform" of *King Horn*: but now for the scansion of these he offers us the alternative of "zweihebig" or "dreitaktig"—not "drei*hebig*" be it observed. For the four cauda verses, however, of which the following is an example—

forþer heo beodeþ of boke
to sugge ase y folht toke
heo shulen in helle on a hoke
honge þere fore

where is every instance the final line alone is regularly more concise than the above inner "Schweifreim" verses, Schipper with apparent inconsistency allows *only* a "zweihebig," that is, a free two-stress reading. Why could he not have been as liberal toward *King Horn* as he is with the shorter lines of this poem and with *Richard of Cornwall*, and have granted us in *King Horn* too at least the alternative of two-stress or three-beat scansion, though he himself may have preferred the latter? Was it not that even with Schipper the unexorcised "Otfrid in England" would not down?

With the surrender of a distinction between "dreihebig" and "dreitaktig," Schipper can no longer consistently classify *King Horn* among the poetic forms descending directly from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative long-line. If his exposition of the *Horn* rhythm *were* correct, no matter what name he chose to give the verse, it would be logically misplaced in any other order of treatment than

when classed among the beat-measures of the alexandrine type, with Robert Manning's rimed chronicle [cf. *Grd. Metr.*, p. 199]. And in the end it would seem that Schipper himself has no whole-hearted belief in a "dreihebig" verse as a new and valuable distinction in English metrical theory.

§ 2. The one piece of collateral evidence that Schipper brings forward to reinforce his theory of a "dreihebig," or we may as well say (remember "*respective*") a three-beat rhythm in *King Horn* is the little twelve-line poem *Signs of Death*. After his statement as to how the native verse developed from Layamon's irregular movement to the "fortgeschrittene Taktgleichheit" of *King Horn*, he says [p. 71] that before we get to *King Horn* we find the same verse-form with rime "consequent durchgeführt" already in another poem. "In dieser Form liegt dies Metrum vor in einem kleinen, zwölf Verszeilen umfassenden, in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts entstandenen Gedichte, betitelt *Signs of Death*."

Now the logic of this little piece points so irresistibly to a simple two-stress rhythm, in spite of the absence of alliteration (except in the third couplet) and the presence of full end-rime, that we may at once scan it. Proof cannot be needed for what must appear self-evident to every one acquainted with the later Middle English development of the Anglo-Saxon free-rhythm.

[H]wenne þin héou blókeþ.
And þi strénġþe wókeþ.
And þi néose cóldeþ.
And þi túnge vóldeþ.
And þe byléueþ þi bréþ.
And þi líf þe at-géþ.
[M]e nýmeþ þe nuþe wrécche.
On flóre me þe strécche þ.
And léyþ þe on bére.[16]
And bi-préoneþ þe on hére.
And dóþ þe ine þútte · wúrmes ivére.[16]
Þéonne biþ hit sóne of þè · al so þu néuer nére.

Morris, *Old Eng. Misc.*, *E. E. T. S.* 49, p. 101.

[16] This accent is in the MS.

Schipper has, we think, in this little poem no corroborating evidence whatever for his three-beat scansion of *King Horn*. Rather should we hold this piece to be a link in our own argument for a free two-stress reading of the *Horn*: for in this earlier poem we find support for our thesis that the native free-rhythm could and often did maintain itself in union with rime without the upholding prop of systematic alliteration.

CHAPTER IV.

WHY NOT FIND IN THE *HORN* SHORT LINE A TWO-STRESS RHYTHM? § 1.

HOW A FREE TWO-STRESS READING OF THE POEM WILL AFFORD A UNIFYING RHYTHM. § 2.

FURTHER ANALYSIS OF *HORN* LINES AND COUPLETS ON A TWO-STRESS BASIS WITH WHOLLY SATISFYING RESULTS. § 3.

KING HORN DOES NOT REQUIRE, SEEMS EVEN TO FORBID, A THREE-BEAT SCANSION; AND READILY SUBMITS TO A TWO-STRESS READING. § 4.

§ 1. Our second inquiry toward a critical estimate of Schipper's exposition of the *Horn* rhythm was this: Does the monument itself, if read with one's mind wholly delivered from the spell of "Otfrid in England," *require* Schipper's three-beat scansion (for we may as well now abandon the confessedly non-significant term, "dreihebig" or "three-stress")?

Schipper would have us read into the verses of *King Horn* a third metrical ictus, to be felt as a structural part of the rhythm just as much as the two strong stresses always present. He would say that his prevailing Type (2) [see above, p. 10] has grown out of Type (1) "einfach durch stärkere Betonung einer Senkung" [*Metr.* p. 71]: in short the Anglo-Saxon form — ∠ (×) × (×) ∠ × has in *King Horn* become ◟ × ◟ × ◟ × (again we may disregard Schipper's own compromise marking with a grave accent).

Now *why* must we elevate an intermediate weak word or secondarily accented syllable of a polysyllabic word to a full metrical ictus in *King Horn*? Beside his selected lines to illustrate the various rhythmic movements of the *Horn* verse, Schipper quotes [p. 72-3] exactly similar Anglo-Saxon lines, in which,

however, the introduction of a third ictus is not to be thought of:[17] and this show of four-stress Anglo-Saxon lines so like the prevailing couplet of *King Horn* would seem to afford a strong presumption against reading a third stress into the *Horn* line. Indeed Schipper himself is obliged to make some noteworthy allowances from a strict three-beat scansion of our poem. After his statement, with examples, of the different verse forms in the *Horn*, and with parallel examples of similarly moving lines from Anglo-Saxon poems, Schipper says [p. 72]: "Alle diese Versformen finden also ihre Analoga in der alliterierenden Langzeile, welche ja noch den Grundstock der ersten Vertreter [the *Brut*] dieser freien Richtung, die im *King Horn* ihren Ausgang durch Auflösung in ein kurzes Verspaar fand, bilden." And again he says [p. 73]: "Für alle [the "dreihebig" types of the *Horn*] aber bilden wieder die zwei Haupthebungen in jedem Verse das zur Verwendung aller dieser verschiedenen Versformen und Typen in ein und demselben Gedicht dienende Bindemittel." True: and therewith the three-beat scansion of *King Horn* is on the verge of being surrendered by Schipper himself.

However, illogical as it would seem, when confronted by such a presumption from Anglo-Saxon parallels toward finding simply a two-stress rhythm in *King Horn*, Schipper (apparently in deference to the advocates of "Otfrid in England") forces the verse of the poem into a most unhappy three-beat shape, disguised under grave accents and "dreihebigkeit."

Let us undertake an independent analysis of the verse of *King Horn*. And at the outset it may be granted that, as compared with Layamon's verse, the *Horn* does show in general greater regularity and smoothness, greater evenness in the syllabic length of its lines; and in so far may be said to display a "fortgeschrittene Taktgleichheit" [*Metr.*, p. 73]. But, that the movement of *King Horn* consciously stops far short of an attempt at three-beat verse, many lines indisputably prove.

That *any* English rimed verse which exhibits some regularity and smoothness, unless provided with systematic alliteration to

[17] See p. 2, n. 2 foregoing.

make doubly evident the native free-rhythm (as is done in most of the fourteenth century rimed-alliterative poetry), is forthwith to be rated as beat-verse, or as "Otfrid verse" for Luick's followers,—this surely must appear an hypothesis, easily to be overthrown by a study of the fourteenth and fifteenth century rimed-alliterative poems, where often the alliteration is most carelessly applied or altogether neglected. Yet this unsafe assumption seems to be the fundamental idea underlying all the work of the Germans on Early English metrics. Since Sievers' exposition of the old Germanic alliterative verse has been so generally accepted, it seems to be a constant presumption in the minds of German metrists that, alike for Early English as for Early German verse, all poetic forms externally marked with alliteration and lacking systematic rime are going to run in the Germanic five-type free-rhythm; while, on the other hand, all poetic forms externally adorned with rime, whether showing much or little alliteration, will (unless the verse under examination is an undoubted Romance beat-verse) be found to run in "Otfrid verse." Again we must note that Schipper is the conspicuous exception to this rule.

This double preconception apparently so widely entertained has, in our opinion, been the great obstruction in the way of producing a satisfactory rhythmic analysis of the *Brut-Horn* group of poems. Whether such a two-fold presumption holds safely for Early German versification is a question not pertinent to the present study; but it certainly does not hold for Early English verse. It is to be one of the main purposes of this dissertation to clear away the misconception that the native[18] English free-rhythm *must* be accompanied by systematic alliteration; and that, accordingly, when we meet an early verse like this of *King Horn*, with no systematic alliteration but with thorough end-rime, its rhythm must be something aside from the direct line of descent of the native rhythm, and hence some sort of beat-verse regular or irregular, or else the English representative of the German

[18] Since it is here assumed that Schipper has overthrown the "Otfrid in England" hypothesis, there is left for us but one *native* verse; there is, in our opinion, no "national rime-verse" in England.

"reimvers," which is itself accounted the *Germanic beat-verse.*[19] Perhaps the secret of Schipper's final compromise to Luick and the "Otfrid in England" theory in his treatment of the *Brut* and *King Horn* is that he too was unable to rid himself of the idea that after all, unless the verse of a rimed English poem is by alliteration visibly shown to belong in the tradition of the national long-line, the presumption is that it is some sort of beat-verse.

Such a presumption of course holds for Modern English poetry. But in the face of that fine fourteenth century revival of the native four-stress verse (with the original half-line now also in detached use as a short-line for stanza refrains or for whole cauda stanzas) and its continued life even down to the present day [so well set forth by Schipper in his chapter on the national long-line "strenger Richtung"], the antecedent presumption for any doubtful English verse from Aelfric down through the thirteenth century ought to be the other way. And in support of the latter view, it should be noted that all the Early English poetry in Romance beat-verse shows a very regular alternation of arsis and thesis, and juxtaposing stresses is obviously viewed as a license not to be indulged in.[20] Hence the conclusion seems safe that, because English measures made on Romance models are from the earliest examples down always so undoubtedly marked as beat-verse, therefore for the period previous to the fourteenth century the antecedent probability is strong in favor of finding all poems of a doubtful rhythm to be in the native tradition of a free two-stress movement for the half-line or short-line, and a free four-stress movement for the long-line. The verse of *King Horn*, although composed in systematic rime and showing only capricious alliteration, is nevertheless a verse whose rhythm at first appears quite doubtful: our very doubt about it establishes a presumption that it is not a beat-verse even of the "dreihebig resp. dreitaktig" sort; but that the *Horn* line will prove on correct analysis to be composed in a free two-stress rhythm, that it will turn out to be the Middle English *short-line.*

[19] The Germans make their "Otfrid verse" a "Gesangvers," a *beat-verse.*

[20] See C. L. Crow's dissertation, *Zur Geschichte des kurtzen Reimpaars.*

§ 2. Perhaps the whole problem of the versification of *King Horn* is typified in its two opening couplets:

Alle beon hi bliþe
þat to mi song liþe!
a song ihc schal ȝou singe
of Murry þe kinge. 1/4.

Now we must suppose that every piece of verse, in which any rhythmic parallelism at all is discoverable, has been composed in some one unifying verse-form; and in order to read the above lines with any satisfaction we must find a general type of verse, under which all four of them may be held together, or else we should abandon once for all the attempt to show any law in the verse of *King Horn*. Hence we inquire, by what comprehensive verse-form may these four lines be rendered rhythmically parallels of one other?

By Schipper's teaching we must read thus:

1 Álle béon hi blíþe
2 þat tó mi sóng líþe
3 a sóng ihc schál ȝou sínge
4 of Múrrý þe kínge.

[Again we throw out of the way Schipper's mere subterfuge of grave accents.]

Now for lines 1 and 3 this scansion would pass; but then we must straightway assume that we have here a decided three-beat verse. How well, next, does a three-beat scansion suit lines 2 and 4? Here we meet the difficulty: for juxtaposed stressing is obnoxious even to the earliest English beat-verse. Line 4 is particularly intolerable for a three-beat verse; but Schipper, in order to get in a third ictus, resorts [p. 73] to the device, which need beguile nobody, of calling it a "dreihebig" A with *secondary* accent—of Múrrỳ þe kínge. Line 2 Schipper calls a C type with *secondary* stress, marking it—× x̀ × x́ x́ ×; and yet on p. 101 he speaks of type C, owing to its juxtaposed stresses, as "der dem taktierenden Rhythmus widerstrebende Typus C." Thus in the

very first lines of the poem can be seen the real reason why Schipper strove to avoid acknowledging what he had in fact done: he is seeking (since the *Metrik* of 1881) an escape from treating *King Horn* as a downright three-beat verse; and with such care does he describe and accent selected lines as "three-stress" verses, that not until after the lapse of eighteen pages can we entrap him into admitting that "dreihebig," as applied to the prevailing verse of *King Horn*, means nothing but three-beat. It is evident, therefore, that in his change of position from his stand of 1881 Schipper has contrived to save only appearances.[21]

If the three-beat scansion, suggested as possible by ll. 1 and 3 above, is prohibited by ll. 2 and 4, let us start out from the latter to find a unifying form for all four. Line 4 is obviously best read as:

of Múrry þe kínge

like an Anglo-Saxon type A with one-syllable anacrusis. It is naturally a verse of simply two stresses. Similarly for l. 2 the natural reading is:

þat to mi sóng lýþe

as a simple two-stress verse of the native C type; and if anyone hesitates over the three-syllable initial thesis, let him observe the far heavier theses not only in Middle English free-rhythm verse but even in Anglo-Saxon, for example:

þāra þe hē him míd hǽfde, *Beow.* 1625 b.[22]

Lines 2 and 4 plainly suggest as the rhythm for all four lines a free, two-stress movement. Can we read ll. 1 and 3 in the same two-stress rhythm? Certainly, thus:

Alle béon hi blýþe
a sóng ihc schal ȝou sínge

[21] But Schipper is now, in our opinion, nearer the truth than he was in 1881: his unsuccessful effort to make *King Horn* something else than three-beat verse was in its apparent result a move in the right direction—although in its impulse it can hardly be considered anything else than a concession to Luick and "Otfrid in England."

[22] Bright, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 233.

and any page of late Anglo-Saxon verse, or of fourteenth century verse in the native free-rhythm, will show lines, having words like *alle* and *schal*, and many logically heavier ones, easily glided over in the thesis of the verse. Hence we can read with perfect satisfaction the four lines together as free two-stress verse:

Alle béon hi blýþe
þat to mi sóng lýþe
a sóng ihc schal ȝou sínge
of Múrry þe kínge 1/4.

While the attempted three-beat reading of the opening of *King Horn* produced an irreconcilable discord, a two-stress reading is entirely rhythmical according to the native English versification: we at once acquire a scansion satisfactory and unifying without having to admit any questionable licenses against our normal verse-form or against normal word accent and sentence stress.

Other undoubted C type verses in our text, arguing for a two-stress reading of the *Horn* line, are:

bi þe sé síde 35
bi þe sé brínke 143
into a gáléie 189[23]
and þi fáirnésse 217,

and also 137, 177, 207, 233, 565, 566, 569, 624, 636 (*non* emphatic), 712, 741, 834, 845, 872, 902, 978, 992, 1003, 1022, 1026, 1045, 1115, 1117, 1158, 1192, 1218, 1254, 1520, 1538. Moreover, one cannot but observe in how many cases the accompanying line of the couplet can rationally be given but two stresses. For example:

with 177 we find— and of wít þe béste 178
and on 189 follows— wiþ þe sé to pléie 190
further with 624 goes 623; with 845, 846; with 978, 977.

But besides the *Horn* verses plainly of the native C type there are other lines in the poem so short that they contain only two

[23] On this accentuation cf. Luick, *Angl.* XII, 448.

words or only two capable of bearing logical stress; and for all lines of this sort a third ictus cannot be thought of, unless we were dealing with a beat-verse of the most pronounced character—a supposition that Schipper himself would not entertain. For example:

schúpes fíftène	39
wiþ sárazins kéne	40
a páyn hit ofhérde	43
schúp bi þe flóde	141
álle þróttène	167
bi wéstene lónde	172

and see also 181, 273, 293, 341, 356, 358, 436, 438, 478, 853, 868, 1209, 1238, 1263, 1277, 1340, 1343, 1350, 1399/1400, 1401, 1403, 1470. Schipper himself provides for some of these (as 1399/1400) with his "zweihebig" type. Again we observe that also the accompanying line of the couplet is often to be read naturally only as a two-stress verse.

Into the same category we should throw the large number of lines where a third ictus is to be obtained only by stressing an initial conjunction or preposition. For example:

and togádere smíte	54
into schúpes bórde	115
at þe férste wórde	116

and see also 178, 194, 310, 391, 505, 550, 552, 568, 625, 658, 1438, 1519, 1532, 1544. And once more notice how often the accompanying line of the couplet has but two logically stressible words.

In many lines of Wissmann's text a study of the variants gives the interesting result that only a two-stress reading will hold together the three MSS. in the same scansion; and besides it is the *two* logically stressed words that remain while the expletives vary or drop away. For example at l. 1135,

C has	Hórn sat upon þe grúnde
and O has	And hórn set on þe grúnde
while H has	Hórn set at gróunde.

Or again at l. 1148,

H has	Béggare so kéne
C expands	Béggere þat were so kéne
and O goes further	Béggere so bóld and kène [for this accentuation cf. pp. 42–44].

Further examples of these variant readings pointing to a two-stress scansion of our poem will be found at ll. 1058, 1138, 1199, 1205, 1209, 1233, 1340, 1343, 1349, 1350, 1406. Indeed we may suppose that in the original *King Horn* very many of the lines were more concise than those of the existing manuscripts, that the poet's own draft would run more evenly into the Anglo-Saxon five-type rhythm than do the extant verses that came from the later copyists.

§ 3. Let it not be thought, however, that only the C type lines and the very concise ones make against a three-beat reading of *King Horn* and for a two-stress rhythm. We shall next examine some quite different verses of the poem. To begin with, take this couplet marked first as if a three-beat verse, a divided alexandrine:

Múrri þe góde kíng
Ród on hís pleíng 33/4.

This scansion might be accepted if we saw that our whole poem were plainly in a three-beat verse: but that the prevailing line of *King Horn* can give no satisfaction as an outright three-beat verse, Schipper himself now clearly believes, since he keeps the poem in the native tradition, and tries to make out his own scansion of it to be something different from "dreitaktig." We may therefore reject the above scansion.

To ascertain the true rhythm in such lines let us resort to the method of analyzing them backward from the rimed end of the verse. For the rime stress of the second line above one unhesitatingly marks—*plēing*: while the riming syllable requires some stress, it is satisfied with a secondary one; and so Schipper marks [p. 74] the exactly similar word, *húntinge* 662. Obviously there is now only one other word left in this line capable of bearing a

stress, that is—*Ród*: so that we have a verse that naturally demands but two stresses—Ród on his plêing.

As to the first line above we now note that to read—

Múrri þe góde kíng
along with— Ród on his plêing

would throw the couplet into discord. Beginning again, however, with the rimed end of the verse, we stress—*góde kìng*, as the accentuation most true to the native English tradition, and in the present instance admirably in harmony with *plêing*. With the end of our line so scanned there is once more but one word left capable of being stressed, that is—*Múrri*.

Putting this couplet together again we have it thus:

Múrri þe góde kìng
Ród on his plêing 33/4.

The two lines are unified in the native two-stress rhythm: the first is the Middle English form of Sievers' D[4] (or more simply Bright's D[2]—see his *A-S. Reader*, p. 235), and the second represents Sievers' A2b[24] in Middle English expanded style.

Schipper has himself scanned for us in the same way [p. 69] an exactly similar couplet from the *Proverbs of Alfred:*

þe éorl and þe éþelìng
ibúreþ under gódne kìng *Prov. Al.* IV. 74/5.

[The intermediate secondary stresses on *and* and *under*, which vitiate Schipper's scansion, have been removed.] He remarks that such stressing of *gódne kìng* is here expressly indicated by an accent: thus, *gódne*, in the Jesus Coll. MS. [In Morris, *Specs.* I, p. 148, the accent may be seen]. And if the alliteration of **e** in the *Proverbs* seems to make that couplet dissimilar to the *Horn* couplet, where there is no alliteration, we have only to turn back in the *Metrik* to p. 57 to find Schipper scanning thus another couplet very like our *Horn* one:

[24] *Altgerm. Metrik.*, 1893, p. 33-4.

Wó is him þat úvel wìf
brýngeþ to his cótlỳf *Prov. Al.* xv. 257/8.

Our couplet from *King Horn* may just as reasonably be read in the native two-stress movement as these couplets from the *Proverbs*. It is to be kept in mind that the present study of *King Horn* has for an especial object to show the existence of the old free-rhythm with its logical stress not systematically reinforced by alliteration.

By the principle of analysis just illustrated an undoubted two-stress rhythm is revealed in many couplets of *King Horn*. Some typical couplets may be grouped under five heads.

I. Easy couplets very like the one already analyzed. For example:

we béoþ of Súddène
icúme of góde kènne 179/0.

and see further 199/0, 347/8, 455/6, 459/0, 503/4, 579/0, 645/6, 675/6, 743/4, 783/4, 803/4, 945/6.

II. More expanded couplets of the same movement as the preceding. For example:

tomóreȝe be þe fíȝtìnge
whan þe líȝt of dáye sprìnge 839/0.[25]
þat ón him het Áþulf chìld
and þat óþer Fíkenhìld 27/8.
[cf. the couplet 783/4 under I.]
hi métten wiþ Áilmar Kìng
Críst him ȝeue his bléssìng 159/0.

and see further 223/4, 251/2, 467/8, 519/0, 533/4, 809/0, 869/0, 889/0, 1313/4, 1457/8, 1467/8, 1539/0.

III. Frequently, as one would expect, the secondary stress will rime with a full stress. Notice first the following couplet from a later poem with Schipper's accentuation:

[25] Schipper so scans the similar phrase—

þe dáy gan sprìnge [*Metr.*, p. 74.]

Ouer heor **h**édes gon **h**ýng
þe **w**ínce and the **w**éderlỳng *Sus.* 101/2.
[*Metr.*, p. 93; cf. Luick, *Angl.* XII. 450,
and *Grdrs.* II. 1017.]

A precisely similar movement is to be found in the following couplets of *King Horn*:

Kíng of Wésternèsse
Críst him ȝeue blísse 161/2.
fórþ he clepede Áþelbrùs
þat was stíward of his hús 229/0.
to mi lórd þe kíng
þat he me ȝíue dúbbìng 453/4.

and see further 661/2, 949/0, 1009/10, 1203/4. 1389/90, 1491/2, 1537/8, 1541/2. In couplets under this head a two-stress reading of the more expanded line is often placed the further beyond doubt by the evidently simple two-stress character of the more concise line: for example, notice l. 453 above.

IV. The liberty of employing secondary stress for the rime is easily extended further to cases like the following; and again in nearly every couplet the one line or the other is so plainly a two-stress verse that only the native free-rhythm will bring both lines under one system of versification:

hórn haþ lúde sùne
bi **d**áles and bi **d**úne 213/4.
þat he cóme hire tó
and álso scholde Hórn dò 271/2.
if þu éure isíȝe
Hórn under wúde lìȝe 1179/80.
of álle **w**ímmànne
wérst was Gódhild þànne 69/0.
Hórn no wúnder màde
of **F**íkeles **f**álshàde 1271/2.
and of gréte stréngþe
and fáir o bódie lèngþe 923/4.

Áþulf fel akné þàr
bifore þe kíng Áylmàr 521/2.
he sóȝte his móder hàlle
in a róche wálle 1407/8.

and see further 247/8, 621/2, 677/8 (nét ihc càste), 695/6 (téres stille). All cases of word subordination here and under the following head are in no way contrary to the rules of Germanic sentence stress.[26]

V. Finally, a few illustrations may be given of the couplets employing secondary stresses within the line; and again it is only a free two-stress rhythm that will harmonize the paired verses:

after knítes líȝte
írisse mèn to fíȝte 1027/8.
and his góde knìȝtes twó
al to fẽwe were þó 51/2.
hi slóȝen and todróȝe
crístenemèn inóȝe 185/6.
Rýmenhild on flóre stòd
Hórnes cùme hire þuȝte gód 545/6.
to-dáy haþ wedded Fíkenhìld
þi swéte lèmman Rýmenhìld 1473/4.[27]

§ 4. We pause here in our process of finding a two-stress rhythm in *King Horn* because the further course of our argument may be better set forth in a separate chapter on the collateral evidence for our thesis. But already some safe conclusions may be drawn, showing that our presumption as to the rhythm of this thirteenth century romance is being supported by ascertained fact.

1. In all the lines above, where a three-beat scansion was possible, the logic of the line nowhere *demanded* three full stresses; and our supposition of no third stress, or of merely a secondary

[26] See references in foot-note to § 4, next page.

[27] All the longer lines in the foregoing five sets of examples will be paralleled in the following chapter by verses from other poems that are acknowledged to be in free-rhythm.

stress beside the two primary ones, is securely based on the laws of the Early English sentence.[28]

2. Though often one line under *different* circumstances might invite a three-beat scansion, yet *here* the accompanying line of the couplet generally prohibited the introduction of a third ictus.

3. Therefore only by a free two-stress rhythm can all the above lines be brought satisfactorily under one unifying verse-form, which is the urgent desideratum for this poem.

When thus in *King Horn* the demand for a unifying rhythm and the consent of the logic of the line go together against a three-beat scansion, our obvious course to get a satisfactory reading of the poem is to observe the two primary, logical stresses in each line; and then, for the great majority of the verses, we may justifiably regard the light words or syllables as forming merely theses, or else for a minor number of verses we should elevate a third word or syllable of more than thesis weight only to the intermediate rank it deserves, the grade of a secondary stress. In doing this we are restoring our poem to a legitimate place in the line of native five-type rhythm, instead of leaving it under the hybrid character attributed to it by Schipper.

To our second inquiry into the plausibility of Schipper's treatment of the *Horn* verse, the answer seems to be forthcoming that the document itself does not *require* a three-beat rhythm, and to a large extent (much more than is indicated by Schipper's assertion about his two-stress type appearing only "vereinzelt") it would appear that it does not even *allow* such a reading.

---

[28] See *e. g.* Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, pp. 163–6; Sievers, *Altgerm. Metr.*, pp. 41–6; Sweet, *New Eng. Gram.*, I, 243–5; Luick, *Angl.*, XI, 396 f.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORIC PRESUMPTION FAVORS FINDING IN THE *Horn* SHORT LINE A TWO-STRESS RHYTHM. § 1.

INCOMPLETE ALLITERATION IN *King Horn* DOES NOT DISPROVE ITS CLAIM OF BEING IN STRESS-VERSE. § 2.

THE ALLITERATION IN THE *Horn* POINTS TO A TWO-STRESS READING OF ITS LINES. § 3.

COMPARISON OF THE *Horn* COUPLET WITH MIDDLE ENGLISH VERSE CLEARLY IN THE NATIONAL FOUR-STRESS FREE-RHYTHM ESTABLISHES THEIR METRICAL LIKENESS. § 4.

§ 1. Our third question on Schipper's theory of the *Horn* verse was: What collateral evidence can be produced against his scansion of the prevailing line of *King Horn?* Pursuing this question through the present chapter and the one following, we shall present many parallels from poems admittedly in the native free-rhythm to show how naturally even the various heavier lines in the *Horn* will scan as the regular Middle English expanded forms of the Anglo-Saxon two-stress half-line. But first, let us develop the argument from historic presumption, on which something was said in the preceding chapter. It was there asserted that in all Early Middle English verse, not obviously in beat-measure, the presumption ought to be in favor of finding the free, native rhythm. On the historic development of Middle English versification, two quotations may be offered, the one from the acknowledged authority on Anglo-Saxon verse, and the other from that scholar who so clearly set forth the rhythm of the large body of alliterative poetry after *King Horn*.

Of the last pieces of Anglo-Saxon poetry Sievers wrote:

"Es bedarf nur einer flüchtigen durchsicht, um zu erkennen, dass auch die übrigen angelsächsischen dichtungen, mit ausnahme

etwa des gedichtes auf den tod Aelfreds und der poetischen homilien Aelfrics, das fünftypensystem des Beowulf einhalten. Selbst so späte producte wie die Psalmenübersetzung, das Menologium, die pseudo-älfredischen Metra, denen sonst der sinn für die poetische form, namentlich für die richtige setzung der alliteration, bereits in hohem masse abgeht, sind in dieser beziehung noch durchaus correct. Im einzelnen werden sich freilich viele verschiedenheiten in der technik nachweisen lassen, indem der eine verfasser diesen oder jenen typus mehr bevorzugt als das andere, oder gewisse licenzen sich häufiger oder seltener erlaubt (auf die auftaktsetzung und die anwendung von nebenaccenten in den senkungen ist dabei besonders das augenmerk zu richten)." Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, X, 451.[29]

And Luick, after supposing different sorts of beat-verse for the short lines of *Sir Degrevant* [cf. Chap. VI, § 6], and concluding that only with the native two-stress rhythm will those lines be satisfied, writes thus:

"Die halbverse der stabreimzeile, die wir früher nur in anschluss an langzeilen fanden, treten also hier selbständig auf. Dass der stabreim schon recht vernachlässigt und verwildert ist, beweist nichts gegen diese auffassung. Auch im Altenglischen erhielt sich die rhythmik des verses länger in ursprünglicher reinheit als die setzung der stäbe; und da der rhythmus das wesen der dichterischen form ausmacht, ist dies auch in der natur der sache begründet." *Anglia*, XII, 441.

Here is the state of English native verse preceding and succeeding *King Horn*. On the one hand the national rhythm tenaciously clings to life, although the old rules are relaxed as to conciseness of form and use of alliteration. On the other hand, late as it is, the same native rhythm still has full sway, although the line has grown yet more expanded and alliteration is more and more loosely applied;[30] and now rime has been added as a systematic

[29] See also Schipper's treatment of the "Übergangsformen" [*G. d. E. M.* pp. 54–57].

[30] Except in the *Destruction of Troy*, whose author was evidently making an extraordinary effort to reproduce Anglo-Saxon rhythm. [See Luick, *Anglia*, XI, 393].

adornment without any disturbance of the free two-stress movement in the short-line or four-stress movement in the long-line. Surely, then, for the intermediate period, in approaching any poem, not self-evidently in beat-verse, it lies nearest at hand for us to try first of all to find there the native free-rhythm, even though the document should be thoroughly rimed, and should show only capricious alliteration.

During that Early Middle English time two rival rhythms were in vogue. According to the native prosody two half-lines in free-rhythm were united by alliteration to form the alliterative long-line: according to the imported prosody two beat-verses were united by rime to form a couplet. Now it is not at all a wild flight of fancy to suppose that a quick-witted minstrel, wishing to produce a spirited lay of *King Horn*, preferred to retain his strong, native verse-swing for its familiarity and freedom; but, seeing that alliteration was old-fashioned and would involve the use of many trite formulas, he followed the lead of most of his rivals in adopting systematic end-rime for his principal means of linking half-lines and for his regular verse ornament, so as to produce a short couplet; and only in an irregular fashion did he employ also alliteration. And although his poem took the form of a riming couplet, he had no fear that its true rhythm would be missed; because attention to the logical emphasis of the line would make the two-stress swing of it unmistakable. When we to-day can readily see how in the much later poems in the native rhythm (belonging to the fourteenth, fifteenth, and even sixteenth centuries) the rime exercises no modifying influence on the internal structure of the line ["der Endreim übt also keinen entscheidenden Einfluss auf den Rhythmus," Schipper, *G. d. E. Metr.*, p. 93; Luick, *Angl.*, XII, 451, and in Paul's *Grdriss.* II, 1016, § 46] all the more readily could a thirteenth century writer see how to fit his vigorous native poetic forms into rime without disturbing their shape.

§ 2. If *King Horn* is composed in the native free-rhythm, it may seem surprising that so early a writer has broken so far away from thorough-going alliteration. Upon this feature of our poem let us ask two questions. First, is there any gradation in the use

of alliteration by the later poetry in the national line, according as it approaches nearer and nearer to the form of the continuous short couplet of *King Horn*? Second, is there not a considerable amount of alliteration in *King Horn* itself, and does that alliteration favor a two-stress scansion of the line?

To the first question the reply comes that there is some gradation. Luick's results show that the later *unrimed* alliterative verse (from the exactness of the *Destruction of Troy* to the indifference of *Piers Plowman*) observes more faithfully the old rule for alliterating than does the *rimed* alliterative verse; and, further, that in the rimed alliterative verse the long-line preserves alliteration more faithfully *while kept intact*, than when resolved into two short-lines. Thus in the thirteen-line epic stanzas the opening long-lines alliterate more correctly than the short-lines of the cauda: for example, in Schipper's *Grd. d. Metrik* [p. 94] there are two illustrative caudae with no alliteration [the concluding line (omitted by Shipper) in *Sus.* has alliteration, but that in *Rauf Coil.* has not].

When the last step was taken and the cauda itself, doubled once or twice, was used as a stanza[31]—and thus the parent long-line was wholly discarded to the advantage of its off-spring short-lines,—alliteration is preserved least faithfully of all: study, for example, the stanza from the *Disticha Catonis* given by Schipper [p. 97-8]. Similarly in the early drama, when free-rhythm is used with rime, there again appears a wholly capricious use of alliteration: in some lines it is profusely applied, in others it is almost abandoned. The *Towneley Plays*, for example (especially in the plays of Noah, the Shepherds, Herod, and the Buffeting), have the old free-rhythm rimed but alliterating most irregularly. And Schipper [p. 106] shows us an eight-line stanza from Bales' *Thre Lawes* with no alliteration at all. As this illustration is very late, however, let us return to the earlier *Sir Degrevant*, *Sir Perceval*, *Rouland and Vernagu*, and *The Feest*,[32] where we find many examples of the long or shorter cauda stanza with little

[31] See Schipper, *G. d. E. M.*, p. 97, § 57; Luick, *Anglia*, XII, p. 440.
[32] Luick, *Anglia*, XII, 440 ff.

alliteration, although the rhythm is clearly the native two-stress movement. Luick gives[33] the second stanza of *Sir Degrevant*, in which but seven lines out of the sixteen are provided with alliteration.

For another example, here is the fourth stanza of *Rouland and Vernagu*, marked as we should scan it:

1 Alle þat **l**éued in gódes **l**àwe[34]
He **l**éte hem boþe hóng and drà**w**e.[35]
3 þo þat he mí**ȝ**t of tá**k**e;
and þe pátriark of jerúsalèm
Out of lónd he dede him flém
6 Al for gódes sá**k**e.
þe pátriarke was ful wíis
& to þémperour he went y-wís
9 His **m**óne for to **m**á**k**e
Hou þe kíng ébrahìm
Out of lónd éxiled hìm
12 Wiþ michel **w**ér & **wr**á**k**e. 29 f.

Of the twelve lines only ll. 1, 2, 9, and 12 show alliteration. Especially, however, in *Sir Perceval* is found the short-line in decided two-stress rhythm but without thorough alliteration. Look at stanza LXXXV:

Now **kn**ýllyne they the **c**ómone bèlle.
Wórd come to Pércevèlle,
And he wold thére no **l**éngere duèlle,
But **l**épe fro the dése;
Siche wílde gèrys hade he mó,
Sayd, "Kínsmene, now I gó,
For all ȝóne salle I sló

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[34] On alliteration of a secondarily stressed word, see Chap. VII, § 4.
[35] For this accentuation of paired coordinates see below, pp. 42–44.

Lónge are I sése!"
Scho kíste hym withowttene létt,
The hélme one his héde scho sètt;
To the stábille fulle sóne he gètt,
There his stéde wás.
There were nóne with hym to fáre;
For no máne thenne wolde he spáre
Rydis fúrthe[36] withowttene máre
Tille he cóme to the prése. 1349 f.

Out of these sixteen lines only six show alliteration. Had the poet of *Sir Perceval* discarded the stanza, and put together his longer lines into a *continuous* epic form, then metrically that romance would have been much like *King Horn*.

The conclusion, therefore, is that the *Horn* line itself is not necessarily something else than a two-stress verse, merely because we do not find here systematic alliteration beside the end-rime. Wissmann indeed supposes an earlier recension of the poem in more thoroughly alliterative form—"dass ihm höchstwahrscheinlich allitterirende Lieder gleichen Imhalts vorausgegangen" [*King Horn Untersuch.*, p. 58].[37]

§ 3. When, in the next place, we take up the text of *King Horn* to answer the second question proposed above, we do find a great deal of alliteration in our poem; and although the logically dominant words in a couplet but seldom alliterate according to Anglo-Saxon rules, nevertheless frequent alliteration is applied to them in a way not without significance. Examples of alliterating lines and couplets will show at once that the alliteration in the *Horn* points to a two-stress reading of its lines.

First: Alliteration marks the only two logically stressible words in the line.

[36] Luick and Schipper would scan this—rýdis furthe.

[37] The foregoing argument from lax use of alliteration after rime was added, is in no way invalidated by the later (especially Scottish) fashion of heaping up alliteration: for that exaggeration is itself a proof of the complete loss of the old rule for alliterating.

hi **w**énden to **w**ísse 123
a swiche **f**áir **f**érràde 170
ure **h**ónde bi**h**índe 196
Hórn ihc am i**h**óte 205
to **b**úre for to **b**rínge 284
in **h**érte þu hem **h**ólde 382
and **s**óre gan to **s**íke 442
bifóre me to **f**íȝte 508
þe **k**níȝt hire gan **k**ésse 599
on a **g**ód **g**álèie 1032
þu **w**éndest þat ihc **w**róȝte 1297
þe **c**ástel hi ne **k**néwe 1465

See further ll. 6, 11, 35 (137), 130, 158 (214), 216, 269, 275, 292, 589, 599, 612, 614, 623, 639, 645, 724, 856, 865, 1112, 1156, 1233, 1270, 1424, and others throughout the poem. Even if it be said that some of these examples are traditional alliterative formulae, none the less do they argue for a two-stress reading of the lines.

Second: In the couplet alliteration links two logically stressible words, and there remain but two other words worthy of stress.

hi **s**míten under schélde
þat **s**úme hit yfélde 55/6
ȝef hit **s**ó bifálle
ȝe scholde **s**len us álle 101/2
þe **k**íng cam into hálle
among his **k**níȝtes álle 227/8
after **H**órn he érnde
him þuȝte his **h**érte bérnde 1255/6
ihc was **c**rístene a whíle
þo **c**óme to þis íle 1341/2
Fíkenhildes crúne
þer he **f**élde adúne 1511/2

These examples illustrate that peculiarly artistic stroke of the poet [to be set forth more fully in Chap. VII] in alliterating the two stresses (1 and 3) which do not rime. In other couplets it is one of the riming words that alliterates with a non-riming word; and again there remain but two other words of stressible significance.

þe kíng hadde al to **f**éwe
aȝen so **f**éle schréwe 57/8
bifóre me to **k**érue
and of þe **c**úppe sérue 237/8
wiþ þine máidenes **s**íxe
þat þe **s**ítteþ níxte 397/8
mérie was þe **f**éste
al of **f**áire géstes 537/8

These are cases where stresses 2 and 3 alliterate. Less often is to be found alliteration of stresses 1 and 4, a linking not permitted in strict Anglo-Saxon verse.

if þu **l**óke þerán
and þénke upon þi **l**émmàn 591/2
þat his **r**íbbes him tobráke
and suþþe gan to hálle **r**áke 1099/0
Áþulf wiþ him his bróþer
nólde he non **ó**þer 1315/6

Third: Alliteration occurs in a way to indicate the presence of the old Germanic order of sentence stress. Four traditional cases of word subordination may be illustrated.

(*a*) Noun with noun:

hé was of **H**órnes kènne 889
Hórnes fàder so **h**éndy 1360
Gódhild quèn þe **g**óde 148[38]
an**ó**n upon **Á**þulf chìld 299

[38] Compare with—The **m**íghty **M**ássidon kỳng. *Destr. Troy*, 313.

(*b*) Noun with adjective:

and on **hí**ȝe ròde an**h**ónge	334
líþe a **l**ítel þròȝe	342[39]
mi **l**ónge sòreȝe **líþ**e	422
þi **s**óreȝe schal énde	
er **s**éue ȝères énde	935/6

(*c*) Adverb with adjective (participle) or verb:

hit **wúr**þ him **wé**l iȝòlde	476
wel **f**éor icùme bi éste	
to **f**íssen at þi **f**éste	1155/6
and þús hire biþóȝte þò	268

(*d*) Prepositional adverb:

þat þu **é**ure **ó**f wìste	240
he tok **Á**þulf bi hónde	
and **ú**p he ȝede to lónde	1323/4
to **f**íȝte wìþ upon þe **f**éld	530

Fourth: Finally, a group may be made of lines in which alliteration emphasizes the two stresses where a two-stress movement of the verse would not otherwise be quite obvious. There is present a third word that might attract attention but for the alliteration of the two more important words.

séie me what ȝe **s**éche	173
wel þu **s**ítte and **s**ófte	395
and do **l**émman þi **l**óre	458
þé and alle þíne	652
and wurþ wel **s**óne is**é**ne	704
and to**g**ádere **g**ó wùlle	870
of alle þe **k**ínges **k**níȝtes	909
ihc habbe **w**álke **w**íde	977
to**d**áy ihc schal þer **d**rínke	1079

[39] Here *litel* has rhetorical stress.

þe **b**óye hit scholde a**b**égge 1097
on **h**órn heo bar an **h**ónde 1131
þe **w**índ him bleu wel **w**íde 1536

The more one studies the alliteration in our poem, the more evident does it become that most of the alliteration which does occur in *King Horn* argues against reading its lines as three-beat verse and in favor of finding there the native two-stress free-rhythm.

§ 4. Further evidence for our thesis may be adduced from a comparison between the movement of *Horn* lines and that found in lines or half-lines of other Middle English poetry which is clearly in stress-verse. If we suppose the *Horn* couplet to be simply a *regular* Middle English expansion of the old four-stress long-line (and not, as Schipper teaches, a rather oblique development of the native line into a kind of three-beat verse), how should we expect it to appear? As a Middle English version of the national rhythm, the unit half-line or short-line would show great liberality in introducing unstressed syllables in the mid thesis; it would make free use of anacrusis; it would show not only secondary syllables of compound words but also full words (often too of considerable logical significance though not primarily important) under secondary stress in lines of the D and E types greatly expanded beyond Anglo-Saxon forms. All these results Luick's investigations have taught us to expect in any Middle English reproduction of the national free-rhythm. And just these three natural expansions of the old half-line,—initially, medially, and at the end—and nothing else, are what we have been finding in the short lines of *King Horn* as we scanned them for two-stress verse. But as a matter of fact will the lines of *King Horn*, so scanned, be rhythmically *like* the half-lines and short-lines of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries? A broad comparison between our poem thus read and the later national verse, both unrimed and rimed, has produced results establishing the absolute likeness of rhythmic movement in the two cases. Some examples illustrative of this comparison are to be found right before us in Schipper's manual. Note the following:

Whon Jóseph hérde þer-òf | he bád hem not demáyȝen
Jos. Arith. 31 [*Metr.* p. 79].

Hórn þeróf noȝt hèrde | til o dáy þat he férde
K. Horn 961/2.

Bot on the Crístynmes dáye | whene they were álle sémblyde
Morte Arth. 70 [*ibid*].

Hit was at crístesmásse | neiþer móre ne lásse
K. Horn 821/2.

To **b**óres and to **br**óckes | þat **br**éketh adòwn myne hégges
Piers. Pl. B. VI. 31 [*ibid.*, p. 84].

þe chíldren ȝede to túne | bi **d**áles and bi **d**úne
K. Horn 157/8.

Lystneþ, **L**órdinges | a newe sóng ichulle bigýnne
Simon Fraser [*ibid.*, p. 91].

A **s**óng ihc schal ȝou **s**ínge | of Múrry þe kínge
K. Horn 3/4.

Further illustrations corroborating our supposed two-stress rhythm of *King Horn* may be most profitably presented under four heads. There are indeed only four sorts of lines in *King Horn* for which parallels seem needed to win acceptance of them as two-stress verse.

Case I is seen in—

and mést he luuede twéie	26
þe kíng aliȝte of stéde	49
þér heo seruede góde	77
grét þu wel mi móder	146
fórþ he clepede Áþelbrùs	229
in héorte heo hadde wó	267

Besides the two primary words (often substantives) there is a third word (as an intermediate finite verb) of considerable significance. We must show that in such cases the third word may remain in the metrical thesis.

Case II is seen in—

if **H**órn is **h**ól and sùnde	1365
wiþ Hórn þat wes so fèir and frè	264 H$^+$
in a chírche of lým and stòn	H 905
Hórn tok búrdon and scrìppe	1085
Rýmenild to képe ant lòke	768 H

This subordination of one of two co-ordinate nouns, adjectives, or verbs must be paralleled.[40]

Case III is seen in—

Hórn in **h**érte làȝte	247
Hórn to **h**áuene fèrde	773
Rýmenhild on flóre stòd	545
and fót on stírop sètte	780
þat éure on þi lónde càm	810
Módi mid stréngþe hire hàdde	1065
Hórn hi of lónde sènte	1361
þe knícht him aslépe lày	1327 C

While a finite verb is in the Germanic sentence regularly subordinated to a descriptive adverb, yet for this subordination to an adverbial phrase parallels may be demanded.

Case IV. An infinitive is subordinated—

(*a*) initially:	and bere **k**ínges **c**rúne	1310
	to speke wiþ Rímenild stílle	291
	ligge by Hórn þe kýnge	1312 OH
(*b*) medially:	Hórn bad undo sófte	1091
	a knícht ligge in félde	1326
(*c*) finally:	Áilbrus gan Áþulf lède	297
	Hórn gan his **h**órn blòwe	1395
	and Hórn mérie to sìnge	610
	and Hórn let téres stìlle	696

[40] This accentuation was not unknown even in the older times (see Sievers, § 23, 3, d).

Hórn under wúde lìȝe	1180
and préstes másse sìnge	1406
Fíkenild er dái gan sprìnge	1433
þat níȝt Hórn gan swète	1441

The subordination, or even reduction to the thesis, of the infinitive (which in grammar is a substantive) in the initial, medial, and final positions must be paralleled; or one might insist that most such lines *must* be read as three-beat verse.

The reasonableness of our scansion under Case I is established by the following parallels:

First, from the later alliterative verse without rime—

Or dére thinken to dóo ·	*Alex. A.* 5
þat ón was called érenus ·	*Alex. B.* 526
Where-fóre we holde ȝou fólk ·	*ibid.* 627
He takis a Bóll of brás ·	*Alex. C.* 55
þen týd it anes on a tým ·	*ibid.* 478

and see further *Alex. B.* 444, 492, 527, 623, 703, 808, 847; *Alex. C.* 473, 576, D text 811+, D 834+, 1076, 1121, 2165, 2498, 5092; *Wm. Pal.* 155, etc.

Second, from the rimed alliterative verse—

At þat gréne þay laȝe & grénne	*Sir Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 464
The dáte na langar may endúre	*Gol. & Gaw.* 1228
Gód hase sent me this gráce	*Aw. Arth.* 127

and see further *Sir Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 515, 1451; *Roul. & Vern.* 569; *Sir Perc.* 2015, 2051, 2202, 2219; *Sir Degr.* 409, 610.[41]

For Case II we notice first Sievers' scansion of similar lines in the *Heliand* [*Altg. Metr.*, p. 43]:

[41] Note further King James' scansion of this line from Montgomery—

Fetching fúde for to féid it | fast fúrth of the Fárie

Schipper, *G. E. Metr.*, p. 110.

gibóran bàld endi stràng 599
stígun stén endi bèrg 3117

Similarly in Middle English we find—

To légge lým oþur stòn · *Alex. B.* 438
þat héuene hóldeþ & hàþ · *ibid.* 642
Of hárd hóngur and þìrst · *Alex. B.* 1029
Oure bóundis ere bárrayne & bàre · *Alex. C.* 3582
Mád & mèrked as a méere · *ibid.* 3921
Pélour, pìrre, ne pérle · *ibid.* 4036
þat so lóueliche láy & wèp · *Wm. Pal.* 50
& hétterly boþe hórs & màn · *ibid.* 1243

and see further *Alex. A.* 543; *Alex. B.* 801; *Alex. C.* 1, 372, 592, 707, 1557, 2050, 2220, 2806, 2876, 3017, 3214, 3387, 3573, 4208; *Wm. Pal.* 204, 699, 1811.

And in the rimed alliterative verse—

A gréne hòrs grét & þìkke *Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 175
kníght, squỳar and knáif *Gol. & Gaw.* 1010
In fírth, fòrest and féll *ibid.* 1357
Éfter thame baith fér and nèir *R. Coil.* 348
His nóse was a fót & mòre
(His brówe as bréstles wòre) } *Roul. & Vern.* 479/0
Strókes bi séx & sèuen *ibid.* 818

and see further *Sir Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 564, 966, 967, 1204, 1205, 1919; *Gol. & Gaw.* 6, 198, 1230; *Roul. & Vern.* 81, 170, 657, 708; *Sir Perc.* 949; *Sir Degr.* 82.

Of Case III examples seem infrequent in the unrimed alliterative poetry. However, cases are found; as, for example—

Let thém þat in héuin bèe · *Alex. A.* 1088

But in the rimed alliterative poetry there are many examples; as—

His háþel on hórs watz þènne *Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 2065
Quhilk béirnis in Brítane wàir *Gol. & Gaw.* 607

& físches in þe flód to bè	*Roul. & Vern.* 741
The hélme one his héde scho sètt	*Sir Perc.* 1358
His stéde es in stáble sètt	*ibid.* 945
The kýng to Cárebedd es gàne	*ibid.* 1062
The wáyte appone the wálle lày	*ibid.* 1214
Bot búskede thame and to bédde ȝède	*ibid.*, 1607
The léttre in his hánd he nòme	*Sir Degr.* 125
Wýne in cóndyt ràne	*ibid.* 1850

and see further *Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 2503; *Gol. & Gaw.* 618, 880, 1009; *Sir Perc.* 946, 1266, 1458, 1462, 1687, 2061, 2078.

Examples of Case IV, the subordinated infinitive, are to be found much more frequently in some texts than in others; but the range of its occurrence is quite broad enough to prove it to be a legitimate subordination.

(*a*) The initial infinitive:

In the unrimed alliterative poetry—

Too bee þeir déreworthe Dúke ·	*Alex. A.* 431
To maken hem cómelokur córn ·	*Alex. B.* 407
Latt se þi wítt in þis wérke ·	*Alex. C.* 5194
To make þaim fréke to þe flíȝt ·	*ibid.* 5521
To flay with flánes of þe fówlis ·	*ibid.* 5448
To bring þat bárn in bále ·	*Wm. Pal.* 134

and see further *Alex. B.* 873; *Alex. C.* 1260, 1261, 2149, 2163, 2236, 2654, 3132, 3278, 3359, 5533; *Wm. Pal.* 1387; *Rich. Redel.* Pr. 29, 52, 79, I. 69, 104, II. 45, III. 287, 318, IV. 25.

In the rimed alliterative poetry—

To ryd þe kýng wyth cróun	*Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 364
To mak you lórd of your ávne	*Gol. & Gaw.* 147
To drye my páynes in this pláce	*Awn. Arth.* 128

and see further *Sus.* 245, 320; *Gol. & Gaw.* 828, 1074, 1199, 1218; *Awn. Arth.* 388; *R. Coil.* 128; *Sir Perc.* 127 (holde), 395 (make), 1058 (fare), 1164 (make), 1430 (ryde), 1629 (bryng),

1935 (do), 2171 (make); *Sir Degr.* 15 (sette), 59 (breyng), 86 (hue), 174 (honte), 175 (breke), 213 (yeff), 491 (breng), 633 (tell), 1051 (se), 1251 (juste), 1343 (spek), 1409 (tell), 1454 (rynge), 1455 (waken), 1498 (se), 1595 (speke), 1859 (scrye).

(*b*) The medial infinitive:

In the unrimed alliterative poetry—

Hur **ch**áunce is to haue a **ch**ílde ·	*Alex. A.* 667
And **ó**rdans aiquare ouire **á**ll ·	*Alex. C.* 3408
þat þou may **m**érote haue & **m**énske ·	*ibid.* 5226

and see further *Alex. C.* 180, 575, 2053, 2948, 4848; *Rich. Redel.* Pr. 28 (give).

In the rimed alliterative poetry—

And práyit him to abyde nóne	*R. Coil.* 284
Quhilk **g**óme suld gouern the **g**ré	*Gol. & Gaw.* 698

and see further *Sir Perc.* 427 (be), 1641 (be); *Sir Degr.* 86 (her), 155 (do), 1043 (be).

(*c*) The infinitive at the end of the line or half-line:

þe **f**ólke of **Ph**ócus too aràie ·	*Alex. A.* 365
þat no **w**íȝth miȝt **w**ílliam sè ·	*Wm. Pal.* 758
& **m**ádest þi **m**én me bìnde ·	*ibid.* 1247
wanne þémperour seiȝh **w**ílliam còme ·	*ibid.* 1262
It sémyd as þe cíte to sè ·	*Alex. C.* 1528

And in the rimed alliterative poetry—

Syr Gáwen his léue con nỳme	*Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 993
þe déle his mátynnes tèlle	*ibid.* 2188
Ládys **l**íkand to sè	*Gol. & Gaw.* 373
Ál þat miȝt **á**rmes bère	*Roul. & Vern.* 80
Sende me gráce þis cíte to wìnne	*ibid.* 200
þat schuld spáine to crísten brìng	*ibid.* 345
Chárls dede þat ýmage fàlle	*ibid.* 347
And he wold þére no léngere duèlle	*Sir Perc.* 1351

and see further *Sir Gaw. & Gr. Kn.* 176, 2235; *Awn. Arth.* 259; *Sir Perc.* 2146 (be), 234 (say), 282 (bee), 358 (dry), 363 (do), 446 (be), 462 (be), 483 (be), 711 (mayne), 775 (make), 831 (bene?), 963 (wyn), 1015 (fare), 1118 (be), 1462 (ga), 1514 (brene), 1687 (lighte), 2178 (ryde).

As supplementing the above four sets of two-stress parallels to the *King Horn* line, we may exhibit some selected heavy D and E[42] type half-lines with Luick's accentuation [in *Anglia* XI and and XII and in the Paul's *Grundriss*, II]:

Even from the conservative *Destr. of Troy* frequent examples may be taken; like—

Býg ynòghe vnto **bé**d ·	397
Mýnors of **m**árbull stòn ·	1532
þat **t**úrnys as þere **t**ýme còmys ·	424
By thies **r**íalles a**r**ýven wère ·	1074
Qwérfore vs **q**wémes nòght ·	1928
But **M**édea **m**óuet hỳm ·	986
The **m**íghty **M**ássidon Kỳng ·	313

And out of Luick's examples from other poems we select—

What **d**éath **dr**ý[e] þou shàlt	*Alex. A.* 1067
Hur ȝátes ȝéede þei tòo	*ibid.* 304
Hur **G**ód **g**ráthliche spàke	*ibid.* 562
A **st**ón **st**íked[e] þerìn[ne]	*ibid.* 830
þis **k**íng **c**árpes anòn[e]	*ibid.* 693
Hóndes **h**éndely wròught	*ibid.* 187
Gáinus **gr**óunden arỳght	*ibid.* 292
Stónes **st**írred they þò	*ibid.* 293
þe **s**éueþe a knýf càuhte	*Jos. Arith.* 577 b
þi **l**órd þis **l**ýf lèden	*ibid.* 663 b
the stérres ben on érthe thròwun	*Friar D. Topias* 9
That nóne unto it a**d**éw may sày	Dunbar, *Tw. Mar. W.* 48

[42] Luick calls many of them A's with inner secondary stress.

and see further Luick's types of lines (half-lines) in *Piers Plowman* [§ 42 of the article in *Angl.* XI].

Other examples of half-lines or short-lines, notably expanded and with heavy secondary stresses, but still to be read in the old two-stress rhythm will be found: in *Alex. A.* 7, 181, 182, 186, 242, 254, 270, 287, 300, 306, 341, 433, 481, 646, 698, 856, 998, 1205; in *Alex. B.* 287, 365, 422, 496, 649, 848, 928, 952, 967, 996, 1013; in *Alex. C.* 259, 346, 467, 589, 603, D text 746+, 899, 914, 3167, 3276 (cf. D text), 3930; in *Rich. Redel.* Pr. 76, I. 69, II. 40, II. 72, III. 142, III. 203 and 309; in *Wm. Pal.* 77, 1643; in *Gol. & Gaw.* 379, 411, 420, 705; in *Awn. Arth.* 206, 426; in *R. Coil.* 75, 205; in *Roul. & Vern.* 404/5, 480; in *Sir Perc.* 1826, 1875; in *The Feest* 325.

Surely the lesson of these later poems in the two-stress (four-stress for the long-line) movement must open a welcome way of escape from the lawlessness of *King Horn* as read by Schipper with now two stresses, now three, and now four in its short line, but with a prevailing movement that makes of it nothing but a bad three-beat verse. If Luick and Schipper freely admit *Sir Perceval* into the native free-rhythm, what is there to bar out *King Horn?* One subtle objection may yet be advanced, to which the following chapter will be devoted.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ONE DISSIMILARITY BETWEEN THE VERSE OF *KING HORN* AND THE LATER FREE-RHYTHM. § 1.

THE PRESERVATION OF A RECURRING SHORTER LINE IN THE LATER FREE-RHYTHM NOT DUE TO CONSERVATISM. § 2.

THE EARLIER LYRIC PROVES THE SHORTER LINE IN THE CAUDA TO BE DUE TO RIME COUÉE. § 3.

COMPARISON OF *KING HORN* AND *THE LUXURY OF WOMEN.* § 4.

HOW THE NATIVE FREE-RHYTHM COULD BE CAST INTO RIME COUÉE WITHOUT SYSTEMATIC ALLITERATION. § 5.

KING HORN THE NATURAL OUTCOME OF ANGLO-SAXON TENDENCIES AND ITS AUTHOR'S ENVIRONMENT. § 6.

§ 1. After all the foregoing evidence for simply a two-stress rhythm throughout *King Horn* there may yet remain one apparently reasonable doubt. For all that has been said, there is a marked dissimilarity between the *Horn* and the later free-rhythm poems: in that later verse to its last development it seems nowhere to lose the traditional difference between first and second half-lines. The later romancers who wrote in free-rhythm either used the whole long-line with its distinct half-lines linked by alliteration, or when employing in full independence the short-lines that came from the resolved long-line, they have formed not a continuous verse but a cauda stanza: that is, they never fail to round up at regular intervals pairs or triplets of fuller short-lines with a concise one. They compose in periods expressed not only by the rime-sequence (a a b etc., or a a a b etc.), but also by the logical finality of every third (or fourth) line as compared with the sus-

pense of the preceding lines:[43] and therefore we find, even in the self-sustaining short-line, the old distinction maintained between the briefer second half-line and the fuller first half-line.

In order to meet the argument from this disparity of rhythm against the admission of *King Horn* into the direct native tradition, one might say that, just as in the case of alliteration, so here we find that in proportion as the later epic forms in stanzas approach nearer and nearer to the unstanzaic[44] form of *King Horn*, the continuous epic in equal short-lines, steadily the ratio of unlevelled second half-lines to expanded and levelled short-lines decreases. The fourteenth century alliterative line unrimed keeps very faithfully the old-time difference between first and second half-lines. But just as soon as rime is put upon the long-line (as in the opening lines of the thirteen-line stanza), there appear an ever increasing number of second half-lines quite as full as their companion first half-lines. Finally, when an epic form of greater swiftness was desired, use was made of the two-stress short-lines that had arisen out of released half-lines supplied with rime in the cauda;[45] but the moment the short-line reaches its maturity in passing from the dependent cauda to the self-sustaining cauda stanza it takes on a general enlargement: so that at least the longer lines, representing old first half-lines, become exactly like the lines of *King Horn* (or even more expanded than the average *Horn* line) as our paralleling above demonstrated. And, more than that, the proportion of fuller lines to shorter ones is always on the increase: in *The Feest, Rouland & Vernagu*, and the *Disticha Catonis* it is two to one (rime-sequence a a b etc.), but in *Sir Perceval* and *Sir Degrevant* it is three to one (rime-sequence a a a b etc.) There was needed a single step further in this direction to produce a continuous verse made up entirely of equalized short-

[43] Luick has shown that in Middle English the long-line became a logical unit as well as a verse unit; in this respect Middle English poetic style differs from the run-on character of Anglo-Saxon poetry.

[44] Wissmann indeed supposed that *K. Horn* is made up of four-line stanzas (*Unters.* p. 63 and *Lied V. K. H.* p. XIX).

[45] See Luick, *Angl.* XII, 440, and Schipper, § 57.

lines—to which the poet had but to affix couplet rime in order to make the rhythm of *King Horn*.

As, however, this mode of reasoning may appear superficial and unconvincing, we shall face from quite another point of view the question why *King Horn* surrendered the distinction between second and first half-lines, a distinction not only graphically maintained in the later stanzaic shapes, but there aesthetically felt, as Luick so finely observed in studying the inner structure of the lines of the cauda and cauda stanza.

§ 2. Luick has admirably *described* the cauda in free-rhythm; but it is patent that he has not *explained* its shape, in discovering for us that it is made up of two (or three) short-lines of a character like the unreleased first half-line plus one short-line of a character like the unreleased second half-line. Why does the later poet use just *two* or *three* released first half-lines against *one* released second half-line? And in keeping this one second half-line was it his intention to conserve even among the short-lines he now has the time-honoured tradition of his national verse in its long-line form?

Both Luick and Schipper, in dealing with the stanzaic verse in free-rhythm, employ a very natural order of presentation: they treat first the large stanza with cauda and afterward the cauda stanza. But, of course, it does not follow that there was chronological sequence here: that is, we are not to draw the inference that the latter developed directly and only out of the former.[46] However convenient Schipper's arrangement is for making a clear exposition of Middle English verse forms, it would be manifestly wrong to suppose that the cauda stanza of short verses in free-rhythm came by origin and as an independent English development out of the long stanza with cauda.

Without doubt the external shape both of the dependent cauda and of the independent cauda stanza is due to imitation of French

[46] A loose reading of Luick's article in *Anglia* XII, certainly suggests this: note especially the sentence [p. 440], "Aber man ging in diesen eigentümlichen bildungen noch weiter." Luick's statements on the *development* of the cauda and cauda stanza are so brief and general that we have gone into the subject somewhat fully, and have attempted to carry his discovery in the cauda further than a mere description.

stanzas in *rime couée* (simple or enlarged), equally so whether the inner movement of the English verses is free-rhythm or beat-verse. The operating cause therefore which kept a shorter among the longer lines of the native short-line rimed verse, was something quite far from any desire of the poets to preserve the traditional difference of the old first and second half-lines. We cannot read either the sober *Sir Perceval* and *Sir Degrevant* or the jocular *Feest* beside Chaucer's parody of *Sir Thopas* without believing that their similar outer form (the stanza unit being two or three longer lines followed by a shorter one) came with their rime-sequence (a a b etc., or a a a b etc.), directly to all four of them from the same source. Hence the presence of regularly recurring shorter lines in the cauda stanza of free-rhythm is to be *explained*, just as we explain the corresponding lines in the same stanza of beat-verse: it is due purely to the influence of the rime-sequence chosen; for the rule for *rime couée* demanded a shorter line in the b-rime.[47] And just so for the long thirteen-line stanza in free-rhythm, we must explain the shape of the cauda itself as in origin the natural outcome of the enlarged *rime couée* that the poet was applying to his released short-lines: the foreign stanzaic mold was sure to turn out a shorter line in the fourth place, whether or not the poet had any thought of maintaining the old difference between the two half-lines even after they were set free.

§ 3. That *rime couée* is the real cause of the external form of the fourteenth century free-rhythm cauda and cauda stanza can be readily demonstrated from the earlier lyric in free-rhythm: because there caudae are found in another rime-sequence, and simultaneously in a shape other than two or three fuller short-lines, followed by a concise short-line. In the early lyric, moreover, we can find stanzaic forms approaching rather closely to the continuous epic form of *King Horn*, because of the application of a rime-sequence less removed from the *Horn* couplet than is the *rime couée* of *Sir Perceval* and *Sir Degrevant*. And at the very beginning of this line of study we find Luick saying of the rimed alliterative lyric,

[47] Such at least was and is the *popular* French and English usage: of course an equal or a longer line *could* be used.

"Die Unterschiede zwischen erster und zweiter Halbzeile sind weniger scharf ausgeprägt, gewöhnlich ist nur die grössere Fülle des Auftakts für die erstere kennzeichnend" [Paul's *Grdriss.* II, 1018, § 50]. Schipper makes the same comment [p. 88].

When in the early lyric a cauda is appended, if it is in *rime couée*, it takes the form of two fuller short-lines (Luick's detached *first* half-lines) followed by one concise short-line (a detached *second* half-line). For example, the poem of *Simon Fraser* has this cauda to its second stanza:

wiþ Loue.
whose hateþ soth ant ryht,
lutel he douteþ godes myht,
þe heye kyng aboue. Böddeker, p. 126.

The concluding stanza has the cauda in enlarged *rime couée*:

Tprot, scot, for þi strif!
hang vp þyn hachet ant þi knyf,
whil him lasteþ þe lyf
wiþ þe longe shonkes. *Ibid.*, 134.

Schipper gives the first stanza of the poem [p. 91]; but in that one the difference between the cauda lines is less than in almost any other cauda of the piece.

Again the *Satire on Ecclesiastical Courts* [Böddeker, p. 109 and cf. Schipper, p. 90], composed in eighteen-line stanzas, has caudae in enlarged *rime couée* with much greater conciseness of the final line as against the three preceding ones. Further, in the poem on the *Rising of the Flemish* [Böddeker, p. 116 and cf. Schipper, p. 90] the whole stanza is in enlarged *rime couée*, thus—aaabcccb; and the longer lines (a's and c's) are intact long-lines, while the shorter lines are of two stresses but with a fullness quite equal (compare *e.g.*, ll. 32, 36, 40, 80, 88, 96) to the a-lines of the later epic cauda and cauda stanza in *rime couée*.

On the contrary, in the early lyric, when the cauda is *not* in *rime couée*, it may take a quite different shape from the cauda that is so rimed. Especially suitable for examination here is the poem

on the *Luxury of Women*. To each stanza is appended a cauda of three lines, riming simply a a a with no rime-linkage to the body of the stanza; and the three cauda lines are of *successively increasing* volume: thus [Böddeker, p. 106],—

> In helle
> wiþ deueles he shulle duelle,
> for þe clogges þat cleueþ by here chelle.
> 19 f. (end of St. 3).

This is an average cauda of the poem: for in the one Schipper gives [p. 90] the last line is overfull. Here we see that in the absence of *rime couée*, there appears a structure other than the sequence of two detached first half-lines plus one such second half-line.

§ 4. There is though another feature of the stanza under examination which renders it peculiarly interesting for our attempt to interpret rightly the rhythm of *King Horn*. The body of the stanza shows hardly any distinction of first and second half-lines; and this has happened as an easy consequence of the rime there employed. The four long-lines have a form of leonine rime, by which the four first half-lines rime together, while the whole lines are riming. Examine Schipper's stanza [p. 90]; or take the following section of the last stanza of the poem [Böddeker, p. 107]:

ȝef þer lyþ a loket	by er ouþer eȝe,	
þat mot wiþ forse be fet	for lac of oþer leȝe.	
þe bout & þe barbet	wyþ frountel shule feȝe;	
Habbe he a fauce filet	he halt hire hed heȝe.	ll. 29 f.

When we look down these columns of half-lines, they appear strikingly like the *Horn* short-line except that the one, forming part of a shapely stanza, plies the same rime four times, while *King Horn* is rimed in couplets. Let us now write out the corresponding section of another stanza of this lyric, as if we had the long-line actually resolved into short-lines; and this we may the more readily do because there are but four instances (ll. 1, 8, 10,

15) of alliterative linking in all the twenty long-lines of the poem. We get thus [stanza 3] :

ffurmest in boure
were boses ybroht ;
Leuedis to honoure
ichot he were wroht.
vch gigelet wol loure,
bote he hem habbe soht ;
such shrewe fol soure
ant duere hit haþ aboht. ll. 15 f.

Put beside these lines the five two-stress short-lines of the poem, noting the expansion assumed as soon as the half-line is released to become a short-line :

schulde shilde hem from sunne 7
vch a screwe wol hire shrude 13
þe deuel may sitte softe 27
þat heo be kud & knewe 34

and l. 20, *for the clogges* . . is given above.

Then read the following passages from *King Horn* :

kíng, cum to félde
fór to bihélde
hú we fĩȝte schùlle
and togádere gó wùlle.
riȝt at príme tíde
hi gunnen út ríde
and fúnden on a gréne
a géaunt swiþe kéne
his féren him bisíde
þe dáy for to abíde. ll. 867–'76
. . . . . .
hi slóȝen and fúȝten

Þe níȝt and þe úȝten [48]
Þe sárazins kénde:
ne lefde nón in þénde.
Hórn let wérche
chápeles and chérche.
he made bélles rínge
and préstes másse sìnge.
he sóȝte his móder hàlle
in a róche wálle.
he késte hire and clépte
and into cástel sétte.
crúne he gan wérie
and makede féste mérie.
mérie lìf he wróȝte
Rímnild hit dére bòȝte. ll. 1399–1414;

Is not the movement of *King Horn* when thus read quite as clearly a two-stress rhythm as the verse of this satire? If it be objected that only in the caudae of the lyric are to be found two-stress units as expanded as the lines of the *Horn*, the reply is that in strictness the *Horn* line should not be compared with half-lines where the long-line is still felt as a unit. The two-stress *short-lines* of this lyric show us the greater fullness which that poet too would immediately have allowed himself if writing wholly in short-lines.[49] Besides, we have already sufficiently paralleled the longer lines of *King Horn* with examples from the later epic in two-stress short-lines [cf. p. 40 f. foregoing]. One cannot doubt that the author of the *Luxury of Women* would have cast his poem into a form rhythmically identical with the *Horn* verse, had he been writing in continuous, swift (that is, in short-lines) epic style instead of composing a stanzaic lyric.

The Middle English lyric in the native rhythm, belonging to

[48] This is, according to Schipper, the one couplet of two-stress rhythm in the whole poem. See p. 9 foregoing.

[49] For abundant illustration of this sort of leonine rime applied to long-lines of much greater fullness than those of this lyric, see the free-rhythm plays in the Towneley cycle [cf. Schipper, p. 99 f.].

the latter half of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth, coming thus before [cf. Schipper, p. 87 § 50—"Die frühesten"] the fourteenth and fifteenth century epic composed in thirteen-line stanzas with a cauda or in longer or shorter cauda stanzas, proves conclusively that in this epic the shape of the stanza's cauda and of the cauda stanza has grown out of the influence of *rime couée* (which everywhere was against levelling), and is not due to any effort on the poet's part to preserve the old distinction of first and second half-lines, even after the original long-line was resolved into two short-lines. The early satire on the *Luxury of Women* shows us the long-line not yet resolved; but already the leonine rime used to link the half-lines has levelled them,[50] just as it has caused the author to dispense with linking alliteration, and to use interior alliteration only so much as he chose.

§ 5. Luick's discovery of the inner structure of the fourteenth and fifteenth century epic cauda enabled us at last to get a true description of it. Not deceived by the external form and the foreign rime-scheme of those caudae and cauda stanzas, he had the keenness to detect in them the old free-rhythm with the interesting difference that the longer verses were released first half-lines, and the shorter verses were released second half-lines; he showed that with the curving of the outer shape of the cauda simultaneously its inner structure varied. And from a study of the earlier lyric beside the later epic we come to see that the particular curve of the cauda when in *rime couée* was forced upon the poet by the rime-sequence he had chosen. We can now understand how the native rhythm could maintain itself even in so distinctly foreign a mold as the *rime couée* stanza of short verses. This imported mold demanded a recurring shorter line: but in the native free-rhythm there was still a keen feeling for a recurring shorter unit to con-

[50] For another example of the levelling of the half-lines, even while the long-line was still intact, see the *Poem on Earth* [E. E. T. S. 29, p. 96]: here are long-line couplets. Again in the early drama, as the *Towneley Plays*, are to be found copious illustrations of the passing of the old distinction between the half-lines after the free-rhythm was put into rime. See also Luick, *Anglia*, XII, 439, on *Basyn* and *Simon Fraser*.

clude the long-line; because the fourteenth century unrimed alliterative verse shows a strong and consistent preservation of the traditional distinction between a full first half-line and its complementary brief second half-line. Then an English poet, disliking the rigidity of beat-verse, desiring to compose still in his free-rhythm, and yet wanting to avail himself of the pretty stanzaic forms of the short beat-verse, had but to string together two or three of his longer two-stress units (so easily taking about the volume of the four-beat line), and conclude a verse period with his short two-stress unit (so easily taking about the volume of the three-beat line).[51] The aesthetic delicacy of the poet is seen though in the perfect way he adapted his native verse-swing to the foreign, fixed shape: where his model stanza demanded merely *a* briefer line, he put *the* briefer line of his resolved national verse, that is, the released second half-line. And behold! without suffering any damage the English rhythm has gone all the way from its original form, the alliterative long-line, unrimed and unstanzaic, to the short-line cast into the stanzaic mold of *rime couée*.

While therefore in the fourteenth and fifteenth century rimed epic of short-lines in free-rhythm, like *Sir Perceval*, a distinction of a concluding released second half-line as against two or three released first half-lines is intended by the poet, and is felt by a sympathetic reader, nevertheless it was, as the earlier lyric has taught us, purely the accident of the outer form and no ultra conservatism of the poets which suggested the retention of this ancient distinction. Already in the second half of the thirteenth century released half-lines supplied with rime as short-lines possessed no inherent ability to resist levelling. And when the author of *King Horn* chose for his poem a continuous verse in couplet rime, his verse form inevitably led him away from the preservation of a shorter line among his longer lines; he had no need for a released second half-line to round out a group of released first half-lines. The final rhythmic difference between *Sir Perceval* and *King Horn* is thus demonstrated to be due to causes other than a supposed

[51] Luick shows the free-rhythm cauda stanza lapsing finally into four-beat and three-beat verse [see *Anglia*, XII, 443–445].

conservatism which the native rhythm displayed even to its last development. That by this conservatism the free-rhythm always made itself recognizable, although cast into rime, is no longer a tenable presumption against the probability of a systematic two-stress rhythm in *King Horn*.

§ 6. The different environment of the author of *Sir Perceval* was, we shall now say, the sole reason why that epic did not assume the continuous form of *King Horn*. Remove the cause and the effect vanishes: this we do the moment we put ourselves back into the early part of the thirteenth century. Just so surely as one strong tendency of Late Middle English verse, even though in the native free-rhythm and falling in a period of an ardent revival of alliteration, was toward stanzaic structure and *rime couée*, quite as certainly the prevailing tendency of Early Middle English verse was to remain in the continuous epic form of Anglo-Saxon poetry, although it was then a period of the fall of alliteration due to a two-fold cause, indigenous development and foreign influence. And the foreign form most inviting imitation in that earlier day was the French octosyllabic couplet, also a continuous epic form. Not less than the author of *Sir Perceval*, did the author of *King Horn* conform to his environment: but for the latter the environment was doubly toward producing exactly what we find according to the present argument; namely, a verse of free-rhythm short-lines without systematic alliteration but adorned with rime, in continuous form but riming in couplets.

Schipper's exposition of late Anglo-Saxon tendencies in his paragraphs on "Übergangsformen" [Kap. 3, s. 54 f.] shows plainly that, by the foreshadowed systematic addition of rime to the *half*-lines with accompanying disregard of linking alliteration, it was into a *continuous short couplet* that the native verse itself was tending already before the Norman Conquest. Schipper even goes so far as to say, "So darf man wohl annehmen, dass der Endreim auch ohne die Einführung der normännisch-französischen Poesie in England dort allmählich in Gebrauch gekommen wäre, wenn es auch nicht zu leugnen ist, dass er erst durch das Vorbild der französischen Poesie daselbst populär wurde" [p. 55–6]. The French poetry came; and it too had a short couplet: so that when

English literature revived from the shock of the Conquest, and the English poets were ready to begin again where they had left off in their native epic style, a rival foreign form [52] was present, possessing such attractiveness that the majority of the English poets turned quite away from their native free-rhythm and imitated the inner structure as well as the outer ornament of the French octosyllabic couplet. Thus arose *Genesis and Exodus*, the *Owl and Nightingale*, and *Havelok*, and all their successors.

The author of *King Horn* was a Southerner, living amidst the French influence; and one might have expected him also to write in the four-beat couplet just as did Nicholas de Guildford. But our poet with a literary nicety comparable to the later authors who invented the free-rhythm cauda perceived that he could produce a continuous epic couplet in free-rhythm, quite satisfactory to the sympathetic native ear. Layamon had been either too careless or too conservative, our romancer perhaps thought, and had accordingly missed the desirable adornment of systematic rime: one could avail himself of this new and popular fashion, without cramping his poetic matter into the rigid beat-verse. Thus this poet did successfully keep his free-rhythm while adding systematic rime to it; however, at the same time, he relinquished all attempt at regular alliteration.

But, after all, what we get in *King Horn* according to our theory, is but a sudden development, no doubt by the suggestion of the French octosyllabic couplet and its English imitations, of the tendency of the last Anglo-Saxon verse to discard systematic alliteration in favor of rime as the means of linking the half-lines, and thus to produce a long verse with leonine rime or a short couplet of levelled short-lines. The Anglo-Saxon *Rime-song*, though a performance premature and hyperbolic, shows the probability that English poets even without the quickening influence of French verse forms would inevitably have moved on to the production of epic verse like that in *King Horn*. And of one of the songs in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (year 1036) Ten Brink

[52] Of course Latin influence also was present, and popular Latin forms were imitated: Orm, for example, chose the septenary.

said that it reads "almost like a poem in short couplets."[53] It may then be safe to say that, but for this natural growth supporting it, a couplet in free-rhythm could not have maintained itself on unassisted logical stress, as *King Horn* does: it would otherwise, in all probability, have needed to underprop its stresses with alliteration, as was very generally done in the later rimed verse of the period of revived free-rhythm.

Could Schipper but have turned away completely from "Otfrid in England," and been as liberal-minded toward *King Horn* as he is to the later rimed and unrimed verse in free-rhythm [see how all the way through §§ 47 to 61 he grants licenses of expansion and heavy secondary stress], he too, we believe, would have treated the rhythm of the *Horn* as simply the national, varying free-movement on two stresses; and he would have described and scanned the prevailing line of this poem in some other way than as a "dreihebig," this is to say "dreitaktig" (recollect the "resp." of p. 89) verse. We shall quote against him one more sentence from his admirable *Grundriss*: of the "ungleichmässigsten" form of *Piers Plowman*, and particularly of its very expanded lines, he says [p. 84]—"Dass auch solche Verse nur zwei Hebungen in jedem Halbverse haben, wenn sich daneben auch stärker betonte Senkungen bemerkbar machen, unterliegt keinem Zweifel und wird namentlich dadurch erwiesen, dass in der Regel auf solche erweiterte Verse ein normaler Vers folgt, der den allgemeinen, vierhebigen Rhythmus wieder klar hervortreten lässt." This is precisely our contention for the *Horn* couplet.

And against Luick's finding *King Horn* to be the perfected form of the "Otfrid verse" in England, we can do no better than to quote his own words on the stanzaic *Sir Degrevant*, the lines of which are very like the *Horn* line. It is to be understood of course that in place of his first two suppositions we should for the unstanzaic *King Horn* suppose: first, the "Otfrid in England" scansion of our poem as a four-stress (or *Germanic* four-beat) verse; and second, Schipper's three-beat reading of it—for in

[53] Ten Brink, *Hist. of Eng. Lit.* transl. by Kennedy, I, p. 97.

these two theories of the *Horn* verse we have reached no more satisfying results than Luick attained in his tentative experiments on *Sir Degrevant*. Luick asks, after presenting a stanza of the latter poem [*Anglia*, XII, 440]: "Was für ein versmass liegt hier vor? Da die reimstellung die der Schweifreimstrophe ist, könnte man versucht sein, die längeren verse 4- die kürzeren 3-taktig zu lesen; aber man wird sehr bald die unmöglichkeit dieser scansion erkennen: ein kleiner teil der längeren verse liesse sich zwar so fassen, die mehrzahl ist aber entweder gar nicht in dieses schema zu bringen oder nur, wenn man vielfach fehlen der senkung annimmt, während sonst in diesen balladen ziemlich regelmässig hebung und senkung wechselt. Die kürzeren verse fügen sich gar nicht. Auch wenn man versucht, diese zweitaktig, die längeren dreitaktig zu lesen, kommt man zu keinem befriedigenden rhythmus; ausserdem sind derartige schweifreimstrophen im Mittelenglischen gar nicht belegt (Schipper, *Metr.* I, 353 f.). Vergleicht man nun diese verse mit den früher besprochenen [*i. e.* the cauda verses of the epic free-rhythm thirteen-line stanzas], so erkennt man sofort, dass wir hier dasselbe metrum vor uns haben: den zweihebigen vers." [54]

In our argument on *King Horn* the "verses before spoken of" are represented by an array of parallels from late Anglo-Saxon and from the whole expanse of the later Middle English alliterative poetry, rimed and unrimed. We therefore similarly conclude that, despite the absence of systematic alliteration in *King Horn* to point out more plainly the two stresses, nevertheless by its unmistakable logical stress the verse is a short-line in free-rhythm; and the couplet is a pair of original half-lines, rimed and levelled by expansion: so that we have on the whole the effect of a continuous series of released first half-lines.

Surely we have an affirmative answer to our third question [Chap. II, p. 11] for testing the soundness of Schipper's interpretation of the verse of *King Horn*. All the historic presumption to be drawn from the native verse before *King Horn*, and all the

[54] Luick's next sentences are quoted p. 32 foregoing.

evidence we can gather from the later verse that is generally acknowledged to be in free-rhythm, combine with what we ourselves feel in reading the poem, to bring to us the conviction that the *Horn* short line is a *short-line*, a two-stress verse in free-rhythm. There was, we assert with confidence, no reason for Schipper's attempt at a "dreihebig" distinction, which in the end he could not maintain; and his actual three-beat scansion appears in our judgment as antecedently improbable and as unnecessary in theory, as it is found to be deplorably unsatisfying in practice.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SEVEN TYPES OF THE *KING HORN* VERSE. § 1.
THE *HORN* HYPERMETRIC LINES. § 2.
PERCENTAGES OF THE SEVERAL TYPES. § 3.
MANAGEMENT OF ALLITERATION IN *KING HORN*. § 4.
CONCLUSION. § 5.

§ 1. Read *King Horn* as one reads Anglo-Saxon, with attention to the logically significant words and in obedience to the very frequent alliteration, and all the lines of the poem (with exception of the insignificant percentage to be considered in § 2) will readily flow into the Middle English two-stress free-rhythm. Of this rhythm there appear in the *Horn* seven types.

Type A [(×) ×́ × × (×) ×́ ×] is the dactylic-trochaic[55] type, presenting four varieties.

Type B [× (×) ×́ × (×) ×́] is the iambic-anapestic type, presenting four varieties.

Type C [× (×) ×́ (×) ×́ ×] is the iambic-trochaic type, presenting five varieties.

Type D [(×) ×́ (×) ×́ (×) ×̀ (×)] is the bacchic-cretic type, presenting six varieties.

Type E [(×) ×́ (×) ×̀ × (×) ×́] is the bacchic(cretic)-monosyllabic type, presenting two varieties.

Type F [×́ × × × (×) ×́] is the dactylic-anapestic type, having but one form.

Type G [× × × ×́ ×́] is the anapestic-monosyllabic type, having but one form.

[55] In using such descriptive terms (obviously crude and quite inexact) for want of any better—till somebody invents appropriate names for the Old and Middle English verse units—I am following the lead of Professor Cook: A. S. Cook, *First Book in Old English*, Boston, Ginn & Co., 1894.

THE *HORN* TYPES—[m]C TEXT.

Type A

I A[1] (×) ×́ × × (×) ×́ ×

The A in simple form (that is, without any secondary stress) is the prevailing verse-type of *Kĭng Horn.*

(1)	Hórn is mi náme	1286
	Knĭ3t wiþ þe béste	1348
	Chápeles and chírche	1408
	Áilbrus gan lére	241
	Wýn for to schénche	370
	Léfdi my quéne	350
	Sóre y me dúte	344
	Hélp me to knĭ3te	435
	Gó wiþ þe rínge	1201
	Rédi to fĭ3te	1230
	Hórn for tabíde	1482 [56]
(2)	Ál þat he him séide	380
	Wórdes swiþe bólde	375
	Hórn beo me wel tréwe	377
(3)	Sénde me in to búre	394
(4)	Rýmenhild him gan bihélde	1159
(5)	Rýmenhild he makede his quéne	1557
(6)	At éureche dúnte	609
	Hi slóʒen kyng Múrry	1357 [57]

[56] An A contracted to purely trochaic form occurs once in—*Hórn let wúrche* (1407); but not another example of this is to be found—unless one reads *Payns* as one syllable in—*Páyns ful ýlle* (1338).

[57] Direct titles are to be read always as proclitic or enclitic to the name and having, if any, only secondary stress: hence,—child Hórn, sire Hórn, king Módi, seinte Stéuene, sire Kíng, seint Gíle, king Múrry, king Áylmare, maide Réynild, Hórn chìld, Áþulf chìld, Áilmar kìng, Gódhild qùen, Áþulf knì3t, Hórn knì3t, and once Áylmar þe kỳng (219) and þúrston þe kỳng (993). Similarly one reads móder chìld (648). But when the title has an article and may be considered a noun with the name in apposition to it, both title and name receive stresses: thus—þe kíng þúrston, þe kíng Múrry, þe kíng Áylmare, þe kíng Módy, a máiden Rymenhild, þe máister kínge. This mode of accenting is fixed by alliteration in the completely alliterative poems; for example,

	He slóȝ þer on háste	615
	Þe kíng sede sóne	483
	Hi fónde under schélde	1321
(7)	In to úncuþe lónde	733
	For if þú were alíue	107
	He schal wíþ me biléue	363
	He uerde hóm in to hálle	625
(8)	Ihc schal þe táke to wýue	560
(9)	And þarto mi tréuþe i þe plíȝte	672
(10)	Bi dáles and bi dúne	210
	At Rýmenhilde búre	1472
	Fram hórn þat is of áge	1346
	On húndred bi þe láste	616
	Þe kýng aros amóreȝe	845
(11)	Gunne áfter hem wel swiþe híȝe	890
(12)	And tók him abute þe swére	404

II dA (×) x́ × × (×) x́ x̀

(1)	Knítes and squíèr	1123
	Ród on his pléing	32
	Tóward þe cástèl	1504
	Lúuede men hórn chìld	247

þe dére king díndimus	*Alex. B.* 249
the míghty Mássidon kỳng	*Destr. Troy* 313

It is assumed that the full Christ name is to be treated similarly: hence, Jesu Críst (80, 84, 148, 1324).

It may also be stated here that a comparative study of the proper names in our poem has brought the writer to the conclusion that secondary stress in proper names is noticed by the author of *King Horn* only in the rime. [See Sievers' rule: the secondary stress in proper names is weak, and may be used or ignored in the verse. *Altg. Metr.* § 78. 2 (p. 125)]. The only exception one is disposed to admit here is the word *súddène*, which could very well be still understood as a compound, A-S. *Suð-Dene.* In other cases though one easily disregards the possible secondary stress when the name, whether of a person or a place, falls in the body of the verse: hence we are to read *And þat óþer Fíkenìld* (26), but *And fíkenylde þe wérste* (28); *Kíng of Wésternèsse* (157), but *Bi wésternesse lónde* (168).

In like manner the potential secondary stresses in all other words, except compounds still felt as such (like *schírt-làppe, nómàn, crístenemèn*), is believed to be dormant in the verse until called up by the rime: so that, for example, we read *Iwént in to knítȝhòd* (440), but *And mi knítȝhod próue* (545); or *And þénke upon þi lémmàn* (576), but *Lémman, he sede, dére* (433).

	Þánne is mi þrálhòd	439
(2)	Wédden maide Réynìld	1554
	Áþulf fel a knés þàr	505
(3)	Wákedę of hire swózníng	444
	Fáirer ne mizte nón bèn	8
(4)	King Módi of Réynès	961
	And míd him his fúndlìng	220
	Iwént in to knízthòd	440
	Þat ón him het hárìld	767
	And hérkne þis týþýng	814
	Heo lóuędę so hórn chìld	251
	And álso scholdę hórn dò	268
(5)	So i ród on mi pléyìng	630
	Þat was Áþulfes cósìn	1480
	He schal háue mi dúbbìng	487
(6)	Hi sédę hi weren hárpùrs	1509
	Þat fáir was and nozt únòrn	1564
	To dáy after mi dúbbìng	629
	Nu háuestu þi swéuęnìng	726
	And þénkę upon þi lémmàn	576
(7)	For heo wéndę he werę a glótòun	1136
(8)	And áfterward be mi dérlìng	488

III e^1A (x) ´ x̀ x (x) ´ x

(1)	Twélf fèren he hádde	19
	Gód knìzt him bisémeþ	486
(2)	Þré crìstene to fónde	840
	Stróng càstel he let sétte	1429
(3)	Tuélf fèlazes wiþ him wénte	1360
(4)	So fáir knìzt aryue	784
	And hórn chìld to rówe	118
	A knízt hèndę in fèlde	1322
	For hórn knìztes lóre	1548
(5)	And a gód schùp he húrędę	756
	Til i súddène wínne	1298
(6)	Hys schírt-làppę he gan táke	1217

(7) Oþer súm màn schal us schénde 680
(8) And suþþe cóm ìn atte gáte 1090

IV e^2A (×) ́ × × ̀ × (×) ́ ×

(1) Kýnges sònes twéie 766
Máni tỳmę and ófte 1082
Múrie lìf he wróȝte 1417
Gódhild quèn þe góde 146
Crístenemèn inóȝe 182
(2) Hórnes fàder so héndy 1358
Sóre wèpinge and ȝérne 1097
(3) Írisse mèn to fíȝte 1016 [58]
(4) Dái hit is igòn and óþer 187 [58]
(5) At séue ȝères énde 737
Wiþ góde suèrdes órde 1524
Mid spéres òrd hi stónge 1401
A ríng igràuęn of gólde 1178
Wiþ Áþulf chìld he wédde 300
(6) Alle ríche mànnes sónes 21
And þi fáder dèþ abéie 110
And on híȝe ròdę anhónge 328
(7) Wel féor icòme bi éste 1147 [59]

Type **B**

I B^1 × × (×) ́ × ́

(1) Þu art grét and stróng 93
And al quíc hem flé 1394
Nu is knícht sirę hórn 509
Oftę haddę hórn beo wó 115
(2) And allę his féren twélf 489

[58] Such A's, with more than one syllable between the first primary stress and the secondary stress, occur nowhere else in the ^{m}C text.

[59] A fifth A type, ^{ed}A, ́ × × ̀ × (×) ́ × ̀, would occur once in *Hornes fader so hendy* (1358) if we should accent the rime words here thus—*héndỳ : Múrrỳ* (1357/8). It seems better, however, to notice no secondary stress here, and regard this as an imperfect feminine rime, as one does with *Móry : stórdy* 873/4, (compare *Módy : blódy* 1263/4), *húndred : wúnder* 1351/2, *Rýmenhìlde : Kínge* 1307/8.

	And in to hálle cám	586
	To him his swérd he dróȝ	882
	Þat ich am hól and fér	149
	Heo fulde hire hórn wiþ wýn	1165
(3)	Also ihc ȝou télle máy	30
	He him ouertók ywís	1249
	Þo fond heo þe knáue adrént	989
	Her endeþ þe tále of hórn	1563
(4)	Hit was upon a sómeres dáy	29
	ȝef þu mote to líue gó	97
	Þat he hadde for hórn isént	990 [60]

II B^2 × (×) ẋ × × ẋ

(1)	To hórn he gan gón And grétte him anón	1375/6
	Went út of my búr	325
(2)	To þe kínges paláis	1276
	Al bisíde þe wáy	1326
	Þat him ánswerede hárd	1080
	Of þe wórdes him grós	1336
	For to knízti child hórn	480
	He was brízt so þe glás	14
	Þat he cóme hire tó	267
	ȝef ure ón sleh ȝour þréo	823
(3)	Wiþ muchel mésauentúr	326
	Bitwexe a þrál and a kíng	424
	Þer nas no knízt hym ilík	502
	Also þat hórs mizte gón	1248
	Þat Jesu crísť him beo mýld	80 [61]

III B^3 × (×) ẋ × × × ẋ

(1)	Of wórdes he was báld	90
	And fúlde him of a brún	1134

[60] The foregoing seven lines in (3) and (4) comprise all the lines in the ^{m}C text that show initial theses of more than three syllables—with exception of ll. 324 (with its duplicate 710) and 1565 given below at B^3 (4).

[61] See note 57.

In héorte heo hadde wó 263
Hure hórn heo leide adún 1133
(2) Al wiþ sárazines kýn 633
Site stílle sire kýng 813
Þat was stíward of his hús 226
All þe dáy and al þe níȝt 123
(3) Of none dúntes beon ofdrád 573
As he nas néuremore ilích 1078
He makede Rýmenhilde láy 1515
He hadde a sóne þat het hórn 9
(4) Ne wurstu me néure more léof 324
Make we us gládę eure amóng 1565

IV B^4 × (×) ´ × × × × ´

(1) And Áþulf wiþute wúnd 1366
Ac Rýmenhild nas noȝt þér 523
And þíder þu go al ríȝt 699
Þat néȝ heo gan wexe wíld 252
(2) Þu schalt háue me to þi wíf 408

Type **C**

I C^1 × × (×) ´ ´ ×

(1) Into ýrlónde 1014
For his méoknésse 1534
For þe tíþínge 1246
And þe tréwéste 1010
Aȝen þré knízte 820
And þe kýng Módy 1263
Þer heo knif húdde 1210
(2) After his cómýnge 1105
Bute of þe kíng Móry 873
Hi gunnen út ríde 858
Hi dude adún þrówe 1528
And þat scholde hórn bríngе 991
He ȝede fórþ blíue 723
He fond o schúp stónde 597
Þat to my sóng lýþe 2

(3)	And into a stróng hálle	1055
	Or he eni wíf táke	553
	Hi leten þat schúp ríde	136
	And hiȝedę aȝén blíue	980

II aC × (×) ×́ × ×́ × [62]

(1)	Wiþ héþenę hónde	598
	And wróng his líppe	1074
	In béggęres rówe	1092
(2)	Under cóuertúre	696
	Under wúde síde	1036
	Abutę hórn þe ȝónge	279
	And his blód aríse	878
	On hirę ármes twéie	301
	Al of fáire géstes	522
	Of þe máister kínge	642
	Wiþ his swérdes hílte	1458
	We beþ knícȝtes ȝónge	547
(3)	Abute míddelníȝte	1317
	Abute Wésternésse	214
	Hit was at Crístesmásse	805
	In to min héritáge	1301
	Into his nýwe wérke	1446
	And ihc þe lórd to wólde	308
	And hu he slóȝ in félde	999
(4)	To fore þe súnnę upríste	1470
	Ihc habbe þe lúued stróngе	304
	He is under wúde bóȝe	1243
(5)	He ȝaf alle þe knícȝtes óre	1547

III dC × × ×́ ×́ x̀

(1)	Til hit spráng dái lìȝt	124

[62] This type Luick called BC. The use of the double capital would, however, tend toward confusion with Sievers' hypermetric types (Schwellvers—*Altg. Metr.* § 95); and besides many of the lines in this formula have come by direct descent from the Anglo-Saxon C with resolved stress : for example—

And do mi fáder wréche (1304)

from A-S. fæder (ȝ).

(2) Wiþutę his twélf fêrîn 1258
(3) Biuore þe kíng Áylmàr 506
Hit nere no fáir wéddìng 423
(4) þanne sede þe kýng þúrstòn 827 [63]

IV eC × × (×) ẋ ẋ ẋ × [64]

(1) I fond hórn chîld stónde 1193
Durstę hym nó màn wérne 706
(2) Ne miȝte nó màn télle 617
Ne schal hit nómàn dérie 792
Ne dorstę him nómàn téche 388
(3) Ne miȝtę hure nómàn wúrne 1098 [65]

V adC × × (×) ẋ × ẋ ẋ [66]

(1) And þat óþer bérîld 768
Of þat ílke wéddìng 936
For his góde téchìng 1546
Ef þu lóke þéràn 575
Til þe líȝt of dáy spràng 493
He him spác to hórn chîld 159
(2) And þine féren álsò 98
Þat he me ȝíue dúbbìng 438
And bed him béon a gód knìȝt 504
He sede Lémman dérlìng 725
He sede léue hórn chîld 1383 [67]

Type **D**

I D[1] (×) ẋ (×) ẋ ẋ ×
(1) Scípes fíftène 37

[63] The foregoing five examples comprise all the [d]C lines in the [m]C text.

[64] The half-dozen lines in this formula might of course be classified as A's with anacrusis. It seems better, however, to call them C's because of the invariable unaccented opening (of from two to four syllables) and the presence of but one syllable between the two primary stresses.

[65] The foregoing six examples comprise all the [e]C lines in the [m]C text.

[66] Compare note 64 on the [e]C formula.

[67] The foregoing eleven examples comprise all the [ad]C lines in the [m]C text. Of course ll. 725 and 1383 might be treated as *inquit* lines (cf. p. 78) and would then be rated A's.

Hórn adún lìȝte 519
Álle þréottène 163[68]
(2) Áþulf his félàwe 1101
Schúp bi þe sé flòde 139
Hórn gan his swérd grìpe 605
(3) Kíng after king Áylmàre 1532
Múchel was his fáirhède 83
(4) Áþulf he sede félàȝe 1461[68]
(5) Fíkenhild me haþ idón ùnder 1463[68]
(6) At his úprísìnge 852
On a gód gálèie 1020
He dudẹ hórn ínn làte 1511
(7) And hym wel sónẹ ánswàrẹde 42
(8) Ibórn in Súddène 876
þe héued óf wènte 610
(9) And togádẹre gó wùlle 856
þat þu éure óf wìste 236[68]
(10) For ihesu críst him mákède 84[68]
(11) For Cútberdes fáirhède 803
Ihc télle ȝou tíþìnge 128
þe físs þat þi nét rènte 727
(12) Wiþ his ýrisse félàȝes 1310
ȝef þu cúme to Súddène 143
(13) Of Rýmenhilde wéddìnge 1030
Me þínkþ bi þine króis lìȝte 1331
His scláuyn he gan dún lègge 1069

II D² (x) ẋ (x) ẋ x (x) ẋ

(1) Fáir and éuene lòng 94[69]
(2) Múrri þe góde kìng 31
(3) Rýmenhild on flóre stòd 529
Fórþ he clupedẹ áþelbrùs 225
(4) Rymenhild litel wéneþ hèo 1473[70]

[68] No other examples of this particular subsubtype in the ᵐC text.
[69] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ᵐC text.
[70] Only three other examples of this subsubtype in the ᵐC text (ll. 10, 323, 1567).

(5) Rýmenhild haue wel gódne dày 731[69]
(6) Rýmenhild undude þe dúre-pìn 985[69]
(7) Hóm rod Áylmar þe kỳng 219[69]
(8) Hórn cam to þúrston þe kỳng 993[69]
[71](9) ȝéuę us allę his suéte blessìng 1568[69]
(10) At hóm lefte Fíkenhìld 647
And drónk to þe pílegrỳm 1166
Þe knígt him aslépe lày 1325
Þat ón him het háþulf chìld 25
(11) And þús hire biþógte þò 264
He séttę him on a stéde whìt 501[72]
(12) Þat éure ȝut on þi lónde càm 794[73]
(13) Þe chíldren drádde þeròf 120[73]
(14) For hé is þe fáireste màn 793[73]
(15) And þat óþer Fíkenìld 26
For a máiden Rýmenhìld 957
Arę hit cóme séue nìȝt 448
(16) Þu schalt wíþ me to búre gòn 286
[74]Awei út he sede fúle þèof 709[73]
(17) Þat was þe wúrste móder chìld 648[75]
(18) Ne schaltu to-dái hénne gòn 46[73]
(19) And alle þat Críst léueþ upòn 44[73]
(20) He makedę him únbicómelìch 1077
And þat hire þúȝte séue ȝèr 524[73]

III D^3 (×) ×́ (×) ×́ × (×) ×̀ ×

(1) Hórn of Wésternèsse 956
Ták þe húsebònde 739
Áþulf hórnes bròþer 284

[69] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text.

[71] This line is one of the three examples (see note 76) in *King Horn* (^{m}C text) of "hovering stress" or "wrenched accent" brought about by the rime.

[73] Only five other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text (ll. 248, 430, 788, 1250, 1566).

[72] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text.

[74] Treating this as an *inquit* line (cf. p. 78), we should make of it a much simpler D^2, × × ×́ ×́ × ×̀.

[75] Only two other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text (ll. 452, 1539).

	Ón wiþ þré to fĭ3te	838
	Hórn in hérte lèide	379
	Hórn nu críst þe wìsse	1493
	Hórn is fáir and rìche	314
(2)	Críst to héuene hem lède	1562
	Hórn tok búrdon and scrìppe	1073[73]
(3)	Hórn and his cómpanỳe	889
	Hórn tok þe máistęres hèued	621
	Críst for his wúndes fĭue	1465
	Críst 3eue gód erndìnge	581[76]
	Fíkenhild férdę aboùte	1420
	Hórn gan to schúpe drà3e	1309
(4)	Áþulf mi góde felà3e	1008[76]
	Hórn was in páynes hònde	81
	Wýn nellę ihc múche ne lìte	1143
	Hórn makedę Árnoldin þàre	1531[77]
(5)	Rýmenhild hit dére bò3te	1418
	Kíng þat þu me kní3ti wòlde	644
(6)	Fíkenhild a3én hire pèlte	1457[77]
(7)	Rýmenild was in Wésternèsse	931[78]
(8)	And hórn nówar rò we	1108
	Þat ní3t hórn gan swète	1449[77]
(9)	If hórn cóme ne mì3te	1214
	And hórn múrie to sìnge	594[77]
(10)	And dróf tyl Írelònde	762
	Wiþ swérd and spúres brì3te	500
	Þat hórn istórue wère	1181
	To-ní3t me þúder drìue	1466
	To hérte knív heo sètte	1215
(11)	Of kní3te déntes so hàrde	872[79]
(12)	Iármed fram páynỳme	811

[73] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text.

[76] These lines are the other two examples (see note 71) in *King Horn* (^{m}C text) of "hovering stress" or "wrenched accent" brought about by the rime.

[77] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text.

[78] Only two other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text (ll. 366, 1441).

[79] No other examples of this subsubtype in the ^{m}C text.

	Þo séntę heo a dámesèle	1183
	Adún to þe wúdes ènde	1228
	Þe whílę hi togádęre wère	1378
(13)	Of Fíkenhildes fálse tùnge	1268
	A crówch of Jesu Crístes làwe	1324
	Þe chíldren allę aslá3e wère	88 [80]
(14)	Ihc am hórn of wésternèsse	1223
	Oþer hénnę a þúsend mìle	319
	If heo ó3t of hórn isè3e	988
(15)	Whane þe lí3t of dáye sprìnge	826
	And sede Quén so swétę and dère	1220 [79]
(16)	For-þi me stóndeþ þe móre ràpe	554 [79]

IV eD[1] × ×́ ×̀ × × ×́ ×̀ ×

(1)	To slé wìþ hure kíng lòþe	1211 [79]

V eD[2] × ×́ (×) ×̀ (×) ×́ × ×̀

(1)	Ef hórn chìld is hól and sùnd	1365 [79]
(2)	Þe góde kni3t úp arós	1335 [79]
(3)	Þi swéte lèmman Rýmenhìld	1486 [79]
(4)	To-dáy haþ ywèdde Fíkenhìld	1485 [79]

VI eD[3] (×) ×́ (×) ×̀ × (×) ×́ × ×̀ ×

[81](1)	Hórn kni3t he sede kínges sòne	1483 [79]
(2)	His fáder dèþ wel dérę hi bò3te	894
	Min ó3ene chìld my léue fòde	1362 [79]

Type E

I E[1] × (×) ×́ ×̀ × ×̀ × ×́

(1)	Þi lónd fòlk we schulle slón	43
	In súddènę he was ibórn	138
(2)	Þat in súddène was ibóręn	510

II E[2] (×) ×́ × ×̀ × (×) ×́

(1)	And his góde kni3tes twó	49

[80] Only four other examples of this subsubtype in the [m]C text (ll. 22, 257, 571, 645).

[79] No other examples of this subsubtype in the [m]C text.

[81] Removal of the *inquit* (cf. p. 78) would leave a very compact [e]D[3].

(2) Róse rèd was his colúr 16
Hórnes còmę hire þuȝte gód 530
(3) And Áþulf knìȝt þe bifórn 532
No léng abìdęn i ne máy 732
(4) Þe góde stùard of his hús 1540
To fíȝte wìþ upon þe féld 514[82]

Type **F** ́x x x (x) ́x[83]

(1) Léuę at hirę he nám 585
Gódhild het his quén 7
(2) Wórdes þat were míld 160
Cútberd schal beo þat ón 828
(3) Álle þat were þerín 1257
Rýmenhild gan wexe wíld 296[84]
(4) Áþelbrus he makęde þer kíng 1545[85]

Type **G** x x x ́x ́x[86]

(1) Oþer al quíc flén 86[87]

§ 2. Of the 1568 lines in the ^{m}C text of *King Horn* there are 18 that cannot legitimately (that is, in conformity with the Germanic rules of sentence stress) be read otherwise than as verses of three full stresses. These are lines 119, 275, 331, 368, 429, 655, 665, 790, 830, 849, 1171, 1199, 1204, 1373, 1384, 1423, 1439, 1537; and they form 1.1 % of the whole poem.

[82] The foregoing ten examples comprise all the E type lines to be found in the ^{m}C text.

[83] On this type see Schipper, *Grdriss. E. Metr.*, p. 85, and Luick, *Anglia*, XI, 404. It scarcely occurs in Anglo-Saxon: see Sievers, *Altg. Metr.*, § 85. 8 (p. 134). Luick called it A^{3}, thinking of it as a catalectic A.

[84] This line and the one following could be made E's by reading a secondary ictus in the proper name: but see note 57.

[85] Only seven other lines in Type F are to be found in the ^{m}C text (ll. 85, 285, 367, 407, 494, 1275, 1393).

[86] On this type see again Schipper, *G. E. Metr.*, p. 85. Luick called this C^{1}, a catalectic C.

[87] This solitary G line in the ^{m}C text is in all probability to be emended by inserting *wolde*, as Morris did (cf. l. 1394 and MSS. H and O at this point). We have let it stand as a separate type because this metrical form appears in other ME. texts.

Two of these lines are made hypermetric by the insertion of an *inquit* formula:

Hórn sede: léf, þin óre	655
Críst, quaþ hórn, and seint stéuẹne	665

This *inquit* is really extrametrical, and not to be counted in scanning the verse; and doubtless the minstrel in rendering the lay omitted such expressions altogether, indicating direct speech or change of speaker by a change of voice.[88] A third line—

Sire kíng, of hím þu hast to dóne	790

is rendered hypermetric by the vocative noun at the head of the verse; for *him* is here used with demonstrative force, and hence has rhetorical stress. These three lines then fall apart from the other fifteen as having in them an *extrametrical* element, the removal of which would reduce them to perfectly normal proportions.

The remaining 15 lines, just 1 % of the whole ^{m}C text, must be handled frankly as three-stress Middle English hypermetric lines.[89] They are the following:

Type A–A	´ × ´ × × (×) ´ ×	
	Hórn and Áþulf his fére	1373
	Hórn tok Rýmenhild bi þe hónde	1537
Type A–^{s}C	´ × (×) ´ × ´ ×	
	Hórn was sík and déide	1199
	Hórn dronk of hórn a stúnde	1171
	Gód ȝeuẹ his sáule réste	1204
	Fíkenhild was prút on hérte	1423
	Rýmenhild was fúl of móde	1439
Type A–D^{1}	´ × ´ × × ´ ˋ ×	
	Hórn his brúnie gan ón càste	849

[88] See Skeat's *Essay*, p. xxxv; Luick, *Anglia*, XI, p. 438 and p. 597; Wissmann, *Horn Untersuchungen*, p. 53.

[89] On the Anglo-Saxon hypermetrical types see Schipper, *Grdrss. d. E. Metr.*, p. 48 f.; Sievers, *Altg. Metr.*, p. 135 f.; Bright, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 238 f.

Type A–F	´ × ´ × × × (×) ´	
	Hórn in hérte was ful wó	429
	Hórn in hálle fond he þó	368
	Hórn is fáirer þane beo hé	331
Type B–B	× ´ × × × ´ × ´	
	Þe stúard was in hérte wó	275
Type B–^{ad}C	× ´ × × ´ × ´ ×	
	ȝut lýueþ þi móder Gódhìld	1384 [90]
Type B–D^{2}	× ´ × ´ × ´ × ×	
	Þe sé þat schúp so fáste dròf	119
Type C–A	× ´ ´ × × ´ ×	
	Þe þrídde Hárild his bróþer	830

§ 3. A count of the various verse types through the whole of *King Horn* (^{m}C text), as scanned in the present study, produces results widely different from Schipper's metrical summary of the poem (*Grd. E. Metr.*, pp. 71–2). In particular we find no such *predominance* of the A type as is asserted by Schipper in his statement that "the prevailing verse form" (a variety of A) occurs "in about 1390 verses out of the 1530 verses of the poem."

According to our scansion of *King Horn* the number of lines in each type and subtype is as follows:—

Type A—867 ll.: A^{1} 785, ^{d}A 44, ^{e1}A 17, ^{e2}A 21.
Type B—76 ll.: B^{1} 19, B^{2} 22, B^{3} 27, B^{4} 8.
Type C—348 ll.: C^{1} 39, ^{a}C 287, ^{d}C 5, ^{e}C 6, ^{ad}C 11.
Type D—234 ll.: D^{1} 63, D^{2} 61, D^{3} 102, ^{e}D^{1} 1, ^{e}D^{2} 4, ^{e}D^{3} 3.
Type E—10 ll.: E^{1} 3, E^{2} 7.
Type F—14 ll.
Type G—1 l.
Hypermetric types—18 ll. Total ^{m}C text 1568 ll.
Proportionately considered, the several types as we have scanned

[90] Here *lyueþ* has rhetorical stress.

the *Horn* are found in the following percentages (carried out to two decimal places) of the whole poem:

Type A 55.29%; Type B 4.84%; Type C 22.21%; Type D 14.92%; Type E .63%; Type F .89%; Type G .06%; Hypermetrics 1.14%.

§ 4. The inquiry into the alliteration in *King Horn*, started in Chapter V, produced results that invite one to a systematic statement on this topic. As to what constitutes alliteration for the author of the *Horn* we assume that his phonology, like that appearing in late Anglo-Saxon[91] and in some Middle English alliterative texts, permitted: (1) all initial *S* sounds to alliterate together—so that *st*, *sp*, and *sc* (*sk*) are not limited to themselves; (2) ȝ and *j* and any *g* to alliterate together;[92] (3) *wh* (older *hw*) to alliterate with *w*;[93] (4) *h* + vowel to alliterate with vowels.[94] And further, when a full word under heavy secondary stress shows the alliterating letter of the couplet or line, it seems hard to deny it participation in the alliteration. For example,

Hórn tok þe máistẹres **h**èued
þat he **h**áddẹ him biréued. ^{m}C 621/2

In this couplet who can miss feeling that *heued* joins in the alliteration of *Horn* and *hadde*? Similarly in the following

Hórn was in páynes **h**ònde ^{m}C 81
Me þínkþ bi þine cróis **l**ìȝte
þat þu **l**óngest to ure dríȝte ^{m}C 1331/2

[91] See Schipper, *Grdriss d. E. M.*, p. 39.

[92] The occurrences of these in the ^{m}C text are as follows:—ȝ : j 1567/8; j : g 1377/8; ȝ : g 459/0, 482, 581/2, 1201/2, 1503, 1523/4.

[93] The occurrences of this in the ^{m}C text are: ll. 337, 365/6, 833/4, 923, 967, 1143/4, 1163/4.

[94] Besides the phonetic grounds that would justify counting these combinations as alliteration, there is the further reason that if these are so counted the author has succeeded in alliterating his hero's name many more times than if he is limited to *h* : *h*; and it is obvious that he desires to alliterate *Horn* as often as possible (cf. Wissmann, *Horn Unters.*, p. 60). It may be noted further that a proper name beginning with a vowel is once at least spelled with *h* : *haþulf* (25). In the ^{m}C text there are 22 single lines and 43 couplets showing *h* + *vowel* : *vowel* without other alliteration present.

the heavy word under secondary stress can readily be felt as alliterating;[95] and in the first line here given the presence of the name *Horn* furnishes additional reason for believing that *honde* is meant to alliterate.[96]

Now on this basis of alliteration for our poem there are to be found in the ^{m}C text of *King Horn* 657 lines showing alliteration. This makes (on Morris's total of 1568 lines) 41.9 %.[97]

In applying alliteration thus extensively to his poem, the author has produced nearly all possible combinations of running the letter on his four primary stresses.

I. Alliteration in the single line, marking the two primary stresses: as,

Schúp bi þe sé flòde. ^{m}C 139

Rarely (as stated above) a secondarily stressed word alliterates with a primary stress.

II. Parallel alliteration in the couplet, according to the formula $a \cdot a\text{-}R : b \cdot b\text{-}R$ (letting R stand for the rime). For example,

On hórn he bar an hónde
So láȝe was in lónde. ^{m}C 1121/2

The other examples of this are found in ^{m}C ll. 11/2 (here allit. draws the stress from the preceding prep.-adv. to the vb. following),[98] 265/6, 337/8, 597/8, 623/4, 963/4, 1037/8, 1221/2.

III. Linking alliteration in the couplet.

(1) Alliteration marks the two stresses not in the rime, accord-

[95] The theory here advanced, if applied broadly to Middle English poetry, may contribute something to Professor Bright's doctrine of secondary stress in English verse.

[96] There are in the ^{m}C text 5 single lines and 9 couplets showing this secondary stress alliteration without other alliteration present:—ll. 81, 109/0, 120 (by means of *drȝf* 119), 149/0, 155/6, 176, 393/4, 485/6, 517/8, 593/4, 1178, 1331/2, 1402 (by means of *ȝrd* 1401), 1473/4.

[97] Any one who is pleased to rule out the *h* : *vowel* alliteration and the *secondary stress* alliteration will reduce the percentage to just 33.5 %.

[98] Compare—

Er the sún vp sóght with his sófte béames.

Destr. Troy, 1901

ing to the formula $a \cdot x\text{-}R : a \cdot x\text{-}R$ (letting x stand for any non-alliterating initial). This was the old rule of 1 and 3, when the first half-line had not double alliteration.

Schípes fíftène
Wiþ sárazins kéne — mC 37/8
In hórnes ilíke
Þu schalt húre biswíke — mC 289/0
Let him us álle kníȝte
For þat is úre ríȝte — mC 515/6
Wel sóne bute þu flítte
Wiþ swérdę ihc þe anhítte — mC 713/4
Þi sórwe schal wénde
Or séue ȝères énde — mC 921/2
Þe kíng and his géste
Þat cóme to the féste — mC 1233/4
Ne schál ihc hit bigínne
Til i súddene wínne — mC 1297/8
He ȝédę up to bórde
Wiþ góde suèrdes órde — mC 1523/4

This artistic mode of ornamenting his verse-pair (and at the same time emphasizing his four stresses), making the one side of the couplet alliterate while the other side is riming, was evidently a favorite device with the author of *King Horn*. He follows this special formula in 72 couplets; and in 29 more couplets [to be described below under (2)] he brings one or both of the rime stresses (stresses 2 and 4) into the alliteration of the two non-riming stresses (stresses 1 and 3).

(2) In a number of couplets the rime stresses participate in the alliteration of the two non-riming stresses.

(*a*) The first rime stress, stress 2, joins in the alliteration of stresses 1 and 3—formula $a \cdot a\text{-}R : a \cdot x\text{-}R$.

Hy smýten under schélde
Þat súmę hit yfélde — mC 53/4

This is strictly in accordance with the old rule for double alliteration in the first half-line, stresses 1, 2 and 3 alliterating together.

There are 18 couplets running on this formula.[99]

(*b*) The second rime stress, stress 4, joins in the alliteration of stresses 1 and 3—formula $a \cdot x\text{-}R : a \cdot a\text{-}R$.

Wel féor icòme bi éste
To fissen at þi féste — mC 1147/8

There are 10 couplets riming in this formula.[100]

(*c*) Just once both the rime stresses alliterate with the alliterating non-rime stresses, producing the unique formula $a \cdot a\text{-}R : a \cdot a\text{-}R$.

Wiþ swérd and spúres brìȝte[101]
He séttę him on a stéde whìt — mC 500/1

There are thus, as appears under (1) and (2), to be found 101 couplets (202 lines) alliterating on the basis of the old one-three rule.

(3) Frequently there is alliteration of one riming stress with one non-riming stress.

(*a*) The first rime stress alliterates with the second non-rime stress—formula $x \cdot a\text{-}R : a \cdot x\text{-}R$.

In þe cúrt and úte
And élles al abúte — mC 245/6
Múrie was þe féste
Al of fáire géstes — mC 521/2
Hit was at Crístesmásse
Neiþer móre ne lásse — mC 805/6
Þe knícȝt him aslépe lày

[99] mC text ll. 25/6, 53/4, 135/6, 243/4, 271/2, 379/0, 395/6, 571/2, 621/2, 759/0, 767/8, 1125/6, 1247/8, 1319/0, 1365/6, 1429/0, 1479/0, 1511/2.

[100] mC text ll. 145/6, 235/6, 335/6, 577/8, 609/0, 611/2, 679/0, 885/6, 889/0, 1147/8.

[101] This is of course counted an alliteration of the rime stress; for when the rime falls on a secondary stress the whole sound group (primary and secondary stresses together) at the end of the line is to be considered as forming a unit, just like a compound word with its initial in alliteration while its second component is in rime: *e. g.*—wýmmànne (mC 67) is simultaneously alliterating with *wurst* and riming with *þanne*.

Al bisíde þe wáy — ^{m}C 1325/6
Bute þu wúle me schéwe
I schál þe to-héwe — ^{m}C 1333/4

This arrangement is in accordance with the old practice of alliterating stresses 2 and 3 (especially in Sievers' type A^{3}). It seems to have been a pleasing scheme to the author of *King Horn*, preferred by him next after his favorite order ($a \cdot x$-R : $a \cdot x$-R); for it appears in 61 couplets (122 lines).

(*b*) The first non-rime stress alliterates with the second rime stress—formula $a \cdot x$-$R : x \cdot a$-R.

Þe dáies were schórte
Þat Rímenhild ne dórste — ^{m}C 937/8.
Hi swóren óþes hòlde
Þat néure ne schólde — ^{m}C 1269/0
Sárazins bláke
Þat dude me Gód forsáke — ^{m}C 1341/2

This formula is followed in 37 couplets of the poem.

(4) In 42 couplets the two riming stresses alliterate.

(*a*) Alliteration of the rime stresses only—formula $x \cdot a \cdot R : x \cdot a$-$R$.

I séche fram biwéste
Hórn of Wésternèsse — ^{m}C 955/6

This formula appears in 30 couplets.

(*b*) Along with the two riming stresses the first non-riming stress alliterates—formula $a \cdot a$-$R : x \cdot a$-R.

Séię ich him biséche
Wiþ lóueliche spéche — ^{m}C 453/4

This formula appears in 7 couplets.

(*c*) Along with the two riming stresses the second non-riming stress alliterates—formula $x \cdot a$-$R : a \cdot a$-R.

He tók him anóþer
Áþulf hórnes brðþer — ^{m}C 283/4

This formula appears in 5 couplets.

(5) Finally linking alliteration in the couplet appears in the form of crossed alliteration.

(*a*) Alternately crossed—formula *a* · *b-R* : *a* · *b-R*.

Þe **k**ýng com in to **há**lle
Among his **kní**ȝtes **á**lle ᵐC 223/4

This occurs in 7 couplets of the ᵐC text, the other six being ll. 365/6, 487/8, 717/8, 893/4, 903/4, 1215/6.

(*b*) Inclusively crossed—formula *a* · *b-R* : *b* · *a-R*.

Gó wiþ þe **r**ínge
To **R**ýmenhild þe ȝónge ᵐC 1201/2

This occurs in 8 couplets of the ᵐC text, the other seven being ll. 51/2, 505/6, 575/6, 829/0, 1259/0, 1351/2, 1375/6.

IV. Alliteration linking successive couplets.

This device was not unknown in Anglo-Saxon (at least in late Anglo-Saxon, see Schipper, *G. d. E. M.*, pp. 41–2). In *King Horn*, however, a couplet verse where the sense generally ends with the couplet, one is uncertain whether to notice alliteration between successive couplets. There is though undoubted linking of couplets when one couplet begins with a word repeated from the preceding couplet: for example,

Of Múrry þe **k**ínge.
Kíng he was biwéste ᵐC 4–5
Toȝenes so **v**éle schréwe:
So **f**éle miȝten éþe. ᵐC 56–7

Moreover two couplets occasionally are linked together by having the same alliterative initial run through both: as in

Swérd hi gunne **g**rípe
And to-**g**ádẹre **s**míte.
Hy **s**mýten under **s**chélde
Þat **s**úmẹ hit yfélde ᵐC 51–4

where besides the repeated word *smite* the letter **s** holds all four lines together. [Note incidentally the crossed alliteration in the former couplet.] And when the sense runs over the couplet with immediate succession of a stress having the same initial as the last stress of the preceding line, as in

> On a squíeres **wíse**
> To **w**úde for to pléie — ^{m}C 360–1

it seems impossible not to feel intentional alliteration. This correspondence of initials between couplets even appears as an apparently conscious crossed alliteration in

> And ȝiue þe **héu**ene **blísse**
> Of þine **hú**se**bó**nde. — ^{m}C 414–5

If then alliteration is to be found linking successive couplets, of course there are three possible linkages: (1) the contact lines of a pair of couplets may alliterate; (2) the corresponding lines may alliterate; (3) the opposite lines may alliterate. Case (3) may be at once ruled out as impracticable; for even in a verse of short lines alliteration could hardly be noticed from line 1 to line 4. Case (2) also seems quite doubtful: for example, in the lines

> Þér ne moste líbbe
> Þer frémde ne þe síbbe
> Butę hi here láȝę asóke — ^{m}C 63–5

does one perceive immediately an **l** correspondence? On the other hand, in the case of contact lines of successive couplets one can readily feel alliteration if stressed words have the same initial. Notice the following lines:

(*a*) Oþer al quíc **flén**
ȝef his **fǎ**irnesse nére — ^{m}C 86–7
And of wít þe **bés**te
We **bé**oþ of Súddène — ^{m}C 174–5
A tále mid þe **bés**te
Þu schalt **bé**re crúne — ^{m}C 474–5

(*b*) Wiþ him spéke ne míȝte
Hire sóręȝe ne hire píne — ^{m}C 260–1
Iwént in to knícȝthòd
And i schal wéxe móre — ^{m}C 440–1

(*c*) And þát is wel iséne
Þu art grét and stróng — ^{m}C 92–3
Whér he beo in lónde
Ihc am ibóre to lówe — ^{m}C 416–7

(*d*) And dúden hem of lýue
Hi slóȝen and todróȝe — ^{m}C 180–1
On myn hónd her rícȝte
Me to spúsę hólde — ^{m}C 306–7

Here are examples of the contact lines of couplets, having like initials to stresses 2 and 3 (in *a*), stresses 1 and 3 (in *b*), stresses 2 and 4 (in *c*), and stresses 1 and 4 (in *d*) of the paired lines; and in all these cases one could easily feel alliteration.

If now one counts this correspondence of initials in the stresses of contact lines of successive couplets as an intended alliteration, the percentage of alliteration in *King Horn* will be considerably increased. In the first third of the poem (524 ll. of ^{m}C) there are to be found 116 lines not alliterating in the couplet but showing *intercouplet* alliteration; and these 116 lines added to the other 234 lines with alliteration (in the couplet or in the single line) make up a sum of 350 alliterating lines. The percentage of alliteration in the whole 524 lines is at once raised from 44 % to 66 %.

§ 5. In conclusion it may be said that the present dissertation is simply an application to *King Horn* of the one way of scanning it not heretofore attempted. Wissmann's exposition of the *Horn* verse was the first systematic metrical study of the poem. He held that it was written in "Otfrid verse:" that each line was to be read with four stresses, the last stress often falling upon final *-e*. Schipper then combated "Otfrid in England;" and for *King Horn* he threw out the fourth stress, especially when it was to be placed on final *-e*. He therefore offered a three-stress scansion of the poem.

Now we have proceeded one step further, and shown how the whole poem may be read in a fundamentally two-stress scheme. Basing our argument upon the Sievers exposition of Anglo-Saxon verse and the Luick-Schipper exposition of the Middle English alliterative verse, we find essentially the same rhythm in the couplets of *King Horn.*

In this process we are, we believe, not only producing a scansion of the *Horn* more satisfying than was either of the verse schemes formerly advocated, but we are also contributing toward the final banishment from the domain of English poetics of the Lachmann four-stress theory and all its descendants. By excluding from Middle English prosody the intrusive exotic form attributed to *King Horn,*—whether it was Wissmann's and Luick's "Otfrid verse" or Schipper's "dreihebig vers,"—we open the way to show a natural and unbroken [102] development of the native English verse from Anglo-Saxon through Middle English into Modern English. With *King Horn* as a two-stress verse there appears a continuous and consistent metrical descent, from Anglo-Saxon times to Modern English, of a unit half-line and short-line in two-stress free-rhythm, doubled into a long-line rimed or unrimed moving freely on four stresses; and in *King Horn* we see this native free-rhythm riming itself into a short couplet.

---

[102] Accordingly we do not accept Schipper's statement (*G. E. M.*, p. 76): "vermuthlich sind uns eben die Mittelglieder zwischen der alliterierenden angelsächsischen Langzeile strenger Richtung des 10. und 11., sowie der entsprechenden mittelenglishen Langzeile des 14. Jahrhunderts veloren gegangen." We hold that just those intermediate forms are found in the *Proverbs of Alfred*, the *Brut*, and *King Horn.*

VITA AUCTORIS.

I was born in Baltimore, Md., on December 23rd., 1870. I passed through the city elementary schools, and for a while attended Eaton and Burnett's Business College. I then returned to the public schools, and went through the whole five year course in the Baltimore City College; from which I was graduated with first honors in June, 1890. Intending at that time to make architecture my profession, I had simultaneously with my City College course attended the Maryland Institute of Art and Design; and was graduated there, also in June, 1890, standing second in my class in the architectural department. During the following year, 1890–91, I taught elementary subjects in the Zion (formerly Scheib's) English–German School in Baltimore. At the end of that school year I resigned; and in October, 1891 I entered the Johns Hopkins University with the purpose of equipping myself thoroughly for teaching. I chose the "modern language group" of studies, and devoted myself especially to English and German. The whole undergraduate course I secured on scholarships. Before the end of my freshman year I determined to get my degree in two years instead of the customary three. This I succeeded in doing: and in June, 1893 I was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and was awarded a "university" scholarship for 1893-94. In October, 1893 I entered the graduate school as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, choosing English for my "principal" subject with History as my "first subordinate" and Philosophy as my "second subordinate." At the beginning of the year 1894 I gave up a large part of my university work in order to accept a position in the Baltimore City College; and there I taught for nearly four years. During that time, however, I maintained my connection with Johns Hopkins by attending such afternoon lectures as I could reach, particularly Professor Bright's English seminary and Professor Griffin's lectures on modern philosophy. In October, 1897 I